

UC-NRLF



B 4 107 571

vidnadsgru
fran fö

AN INVESTIGATION

INTO

THE LANGUAGE OF ROBINSON CRUSOE

AS

COMPARED WITH THAT OF OTHER
18TH CENTURY WORKS

BY

GUSTAF L:SON LANNERT



UPPSALA 1910
ALMQVIST & WIKSELLS BOKTRYCKERI-A.-B.



F. N. 263
L. F.
N. 1

AN INVESTIGATION
INTO
THE LANGUAGE OF ROBINSON CRUSOE
AS
COMPARED WITH THAT OF OTHER
18TH CENTURY WORKS

BY

GUSTAF L:SON LANNERT
//

— ◆ —

UPPSALA 1910
ALMQVIST & WIKSELLS BOKTRYCKERI-A.-B.



LOAN STACK

forskrift
- 123
1

Preface.

Now that I have arrived at the termination of the first part of my treatise — the second part, for which I already have a complete collection of materials, and parts of which are ready in MS, will, I trust, be out in print within the very near future — it is for me a pleasant duty to express my sincere thanks to all those who in one way or another have assisted me in the preparation of this little work. In particular, I beg to acknowledge my deep obligation to my esteemed teachers during the course of my academic studies, the Professors AXEL ERDMANN, Uppsala, ERIK BJÖRCKMAN, Göteborg, and EILERT EKWALL, Lund, whose advice and many valuable suggestions have been of great service to me. Finally, for looking through the English of my MS and for assistance in reading the proof-sheets I am indebted to Mr. GRENVILLE GROVE (Late Scholar of Hertford College, Oxford), and Mr. WILLIAM SAVAGE, English teachers at Stockholm.

Stockholm, May 1910.

GUSTAF L:SON LANNERT.

Table of Contents.

	Page
Preface	III
Table of Contents	IV
Abbreviations and signs	VI
Bibliography	
A. Grammatical works, etc. consulted and referred to	VIII
B. Editions employed	XI
 Introduction.	
Earlier works on 18th cent. English. — My plan of work. —	
General remarks on the language of RC	1
Orthography	22
Some phonological notes	23
 Accidence.	
I. The indefinite article	28
II. Substantives.	
A. Plural of substantives	31
B. Gender	39
III. Adjectives.	
Comparison of adjectives.	
A. Regular comparison	41
B. Double comparison	45
IV. Numerals	47
V. Pronouns.	
A. Personal pronouns.	
1. Thou	48
2. Ye	52
3. 'Em	55
B. Indefinite pronouns.	
1. T'other, the t'other	57
2. Other instead of PE others	58
VI. Verbs.	
A. Simple tenses.	
1. Present tense.	
Endings of the first and third pers. sing.	60
The form ha'.	64

	Page
2. Past tenses.	
Strong verbs.	
Preterite	66
Past participle	75
Weak verbs	83
Mixing of strong and weak inflection	88
Auxiliaries	92
B. Periphrastic tenses.	
1. The formation of the perfect and pluperfect of certain intransitive verbs	94
2. The periphrasis with <i>to do</i>	103
VII. The adjectival adverb	110
1. Used as an intensive	111
2. Used as a purely adverbial adjunct	116
Index	119

Abbreviations and Signs.

<i>acc.</i> = accusative.	<i>indef.</i> = indefinite.
<i>act.</i> = active.	<i>infin.</i> = infinitive.
<i>adj.</i> = adjective, adjectival.	<i>inst.</i> = instance(s).
<i>adv.</i> = adverb(ally).	<i>Intr.</i> = Introduction.
<i>Angl. Beibl.</i> = Beiblatt zu Anglia.	<i>irreg.</i> = irregular.
<i>arch.</i> = archaic.	<i>itr.</i> = intransitive.
<i>Archiv</i> = Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen.	<i>L.</i> = London.
<i>attrib.</i> = attributive(ly).	<i>lang.</i> = language.
<i>aux.</i> = auxiliary.	<i>lit.</i> = literary.
<i>BB</i> = Biblioteca Britanica.	<i>masc.</i> = masculine.
<i>bef.</i> = before.	<i>ME</i> = Middle English.
<i>CD</i> = Century Dictionary (Whitney).	<i>MnE</i> = Modern English.
<i>c(ent).</i> = century.	<i>NE</i> = New English.
<i>colloq.</i> = colloquial(ly).	<i>NED</i> = New English Dictionary (Murray).
<i>contemp.</i> = contemporary.	<i>nom.</i> = nominative.
<i>D.</i> = Defoc.	<i>obj.</i> = objective.
<i>dat.</i> = dative.	<i>obl.</i> = oblique
<i>def.</i> = definite.	<i>obs.</i> = obsolete.
<i>dial.</i> = dialect(al).	<i>obsol.</i> = obsolescent.
<i>DNB</i> = Dictionary of National Bio- graphy.	<i>OE</i> = Old English.
<i>ed.</i> = edited, edition(s).	<i>OF</i> = Old French.
<i>Engl.</i> = English.	<i>op(.</i> <i>c(it).</i> = opus citatum.
<i>esp.</i> = especially.	<i>orig.</i> = original(ly).
<i>ESt.</i> = Englische Studien.	<i>p.</i> , <i>pp.</i> = page(s).
<i>ex.</i> = example(s).	<i>pa.</i> <i>pple.</i> = passive or past participle.
<i>fem.</i> = female.	<i>pass.</i> = passive.
<i>fig.</i> = figurative(ly).	<i>PE</i> = present day English.
<i>gen.</i> = general(ly).	<i>pers.</i> = person(al).
<i>gram.</i> = grammar(ian), grammatical.	<i>pple.</i> = participle.
<i>hist.</i> = history, historical.	<i>prec.</i> = preceding.
<i>i. e.</i> = id est (that is).	<i>pres.</i> = present.
<i>ind.</i> = indicative.	<i>pret.</i> = preterite.
	<i>pron.</i> = pronoun.

publ. = published.

tr. = transitive.

reg. = regular.

vb. = verb.

resp. = respective(l)y.

vol. = volume(s).

sb. = substantive.

vulg. = vulgar.

Sh. = Shakespeare.

Zs. = Zeitschrift.

sing. = singular.

A vertical stroke (|) indicates end of line.

For abbreviations of other works used and quoted see 'Bibliography'
p. VIII ff.

Other abbreviations and signs will be understood without explanation.

Bibliography.

A. Grammatical works, etc. consulted and referred to.¹

ABBOTT, E. A., *A Shakespearian Grammar*, 1901.
ARNOLD, TH., *Grammatica Anglicana Concentrata*, 1736.
BAILEY, N., *An Orthographical Dictionary of the English Tongue*, 1727.
BECKMAN, E., *Über die doppelformigen Englischen Adjektiv-Adverbien*, Archiv, 1880.
BORST, E., *Die Gradadverbien im Englischen*, 1902.
BRADLEY, H., *The Making of English*, 1904.
BRIGHTLAND, J., *A Grammar of the English Tongue*, etc., 1712.
COOPER, C., *Grammatica Linguæ Anglicanæ*, 1685.
CRAIK, G. L., *The English of Shakespeare*, 1900.
DE VERE, SCHEELE, *Studies in English*, 1867.
DYCHE, TH., *The Spelling Dictionary*, 1725.
EARLE, J., *The Philology of the English Tongue*, 1880.
—, *English Prose, its Elements and Usage*, 1890.
EKWALL, E., *Dr. John Jones's Practical Phonography* (1701), 1907.
ELLIS, A. J., *On Early English Pronunciation*, 1869—89.
ELSTER, E., *Prinzipien der Litteraturwissenschaft*, 1897.
FRANZ, W., *Die Dialektsprache bei Ch. Dickens*, ESt. 12 [Fr. Dial.].
—, *Zur Syntax des älteren Neuenglisch*, ESt. 17, 18 [Fr. Synt.].
—, *Shakespeare-Grammatik*, 1900.
GREENWOOD, J., *An Essay towards a Practical English Grammar*.
Third ed. with additions, 1729 [Gr.].
—, *The Royal English Grammar*, 1737 [Gr. 1737].²
HALL, FITZ-EDW., *Recent Exemplifications of false Philology*, 1872.
[Hall Ex.]
HALL, FITZ-EDW., *Modern English*, 1873.

¹ When referring to a certain work I have gen. only given the author's name of the work in question. Where abbreviations are used, they will be found in square brackets.

² Pressed by his 'learned friends' and esp. 'the learned Dr. Watts' Greenwood undertook to edit this abridged ed. (173 pp.) of his *Essay*.

HOLTHAUSEN, F., *Die Englische Aussprache bis zum Jahre 1750, 1895—1896.*

HORN, W., *Historische Neuenglische Grammatik I*, 1908.

JESPERSEN, O., *Progress in Language*, 1894.

—, *Growth and Structure of the English Language*, 1905. [Jesp. Str.].

JOHNSON, S., *A Dictionary of the English Language* [JDict.] . . . to which are prefixed . . . *An English Grammar* [JGr.], 1755.

JONSON, BEN., *The English Grammar*, etc., 1640.

JONES, J., *The New Art of Spelling*, 1704.

KÆSEBIER, K., *Beobachtungen über den Sprachgebrauch in Samuel Pepy's 'Diary'*, 1898.

KLAPPERICH, J., *Zur Sprache des Lustspieldichters Sheridan*, 1892.

KOCH, C. F., *Historische Grammatik der englischen Sprache*, 1863 —69.

KRÜGER, G., *Schwierigkeiten des Englischen*, 1898—1904.

LEDIARD, Th., *Grammatica Anglicana Critica*, etc., 1726 [L.ed.].

MAITTAIRE, M., *The English Grammar*, etc., 1712.

MARSH, GEO., *Lectures on the English Language*, 1862.

MÄTZNER, E., *Englische Grammatik*, 1860—65.

MIEGE, G., *Nouvelle Méthode pour apprendre l'Anglois*, 1685.

MINTO, W., *A Manual of English Prose Literature*, 1886.

MORRIS, R., *Historical Outlines of English Accidence*, 1893.

OBSERVATIONS upon the English Language, 1752.

ÖSTERGREN, O., *Stilistiska studier i Törneros' språk*, 1905.

PEGGE, S., *Anecdotes of the English Language*, 1803.¹

POUND, L., *The Comparison of Adjectives in English in the XV and the XVI century*, 1901.

REUSCH, J., *Die alten syntaktischen Reste im modernen Slang*, 1894.

SPIES, H., *Studien zur Geschichte des Englischen Pronomens im XV u. XVI Jahrhundert*, 1897.

STOFFEL, C., *Antiquated and Obsolescent Phrases in the Vicar of Wakefield*, *Taalstudie 1880* [Stoffel VW].

—, *Studies in English*, 1894.

—, *Intensives and Down-toners*, 1901.

STORM, J., *Englische Philologie*, 1892—96.

SWEET, H., *A New English Grammar*, 1900—1903.

SWIFT, J., *A Proposal for Correcting Improving and Ascertaining the English Tongue*, 1712 [Sw. Prop.].

UHRSTRÖM, W., *Studies on the Language of Samuel Richardson*, 1907.

¹ A second ed. 'enlarged and corrected' appeared 1814. — A third ed. 'with further additions' was edited 1844 by the Rev. H. Christmas.

ULLRICH, H., *Robinson und Robinsonaden*, 1898.
 VODOZ, I., *An Essay on the Prose of John Milton*, 1895.
 THE VULGARITIES of Speech corrected, etc., 1826 [Vulg. corr.].
 WALLIS, J., *Grammatica Linguae Anglicanae*, Oxoniæ 1674.¹

¹ This grammar, perhaps the best of all I have used and quoted, must be considered to be a very remarkable work, written by a scholar of uncommon linguistic talent for his time. It has also received the estimation rightly due to it not only from modern scholars and grammarians, but also from those of the 18th c.

In *A Student's pastime* (1896) SKEAT gives us a collection of some older English grammars which, 'should certainly be examined' for NED. Among those that first of all should be read he mentions Wallis, to which alone he gives the epithet 'valuable'. That even the contemp. and succeeding generation of Wallis shared Skeat's opinion in this respect is obvious from the great popularity the work enjoyed, and not least among his fellow grammarians, who, to use Greenwood's words about his literary pirates, 'were pleased to take such particular notice of the book, as to make frequent abstracts and abridgements of it', generally without ever indicating any source at all. — 'Editio Prima' of this grammar was published 'Oxoniae 1653'. Long after the death of Wallis (1703) THOMAS HOLLIS, (see BB) edited the fifth and last ed. of the very popular work 1765. — As far as I can judge from a hasty collation of the ed. from 'editio tertia' 1664 up to the ed. of 1765, those sections that are of special interest for my present work — *De Sonorum Formatione*, *De Pronunciatione*, and the section *De Anglicanae Linguae Structura*, very nearly corresponding to what nowadays is called *accidence*, — are in the main only reprinted word for word from preceding issues. On this account the statements given in the ed. of 1765 can by no means be considered as giving us any satisfactory information of the language written and spoken about the middle of the 18th c. The same remark applies of course in the first place to S. JOHNSON and also mutatis mutandis to Wallis's pirates at the beginning of the century: BRIGHTLAND, GREENWOOD, MAITTAIRE and ARNOLD. Herewith we have also arrived at the question as to what extent the 18th c. gram. have, without more ado, translated and copied Wallis. (Here some general remarks; particulars will be pointed out in their resp. places). The most assiduous in this respect are BRIGHTLAND and JOHNSON. But as far as I can discover, the former never indicates any source at all. — In 'Etymology', Wallis's 'De Anglicanae Linguae Structura', we can trace on every page how Johnson has more or less obviously been influenced by Wallis. As regards the section of *irregular verbs* this strong influence practically assumes the character of plagiarism. In an introductory remark to 'Derivation', which upon the whole is only an abridgment of Wallis's 'Etymologia', he is, however, candid enough to express in different places his obligation to Wallis.

WARD, W., An Essay on Grammar as it may be applied to the English Language, in two Treatises, 1765.
 WIDHOLM, A. E., Grammatical Notes on the Language of John Bunyan, 1877.
 WRIGHT, J., The English Dialect Grammar, 1905.

B. Editions employed.

1. Editions of 17th and 18th cent. works other than Robinson Crusoe I.

BURNEY, Fr., Evelina or A Young Lady's Entrance into the World I—III, 1778 [Ev.]¹

In order to show GREENWOOD's free and easy style of proceeding, I can here mention that both his introductory remarks to 'A Praxis on the Grammar' and the explanatory notes on 'The Apostles' Creed' and 'The Lord's Prayer' (copied in their turn, together with many other things, by ARNOLD) are practically nothing but a translation, line for line, of Wallis's 'Praxis Grammatica' appearing, for the first time, besides many other additions, as an appendix to 'Editio Quarta' 1674.

¹ The work, which is written in the form of letters, is a very bulky volume in three parts, 761 pages. Its principal value consists, perhaps, in the author's giving us specimens of all phases, esp. of spoken English from the most vulgar, right up to the most refined speech of well educated ladies and gentlemen. — Lowest in the scale among the characters as represented by the author comes *Madame Duval* [D] 'a late waiting girl at a tavern, vulgar and illiterate'. — The *footmen* and *coachmen* (e.g. II. 216) are represented as on the same level of erudition and grammatical knowledge in their way of speaking as their successors of the present day. — *Mr. Mirvan* [c] the very coarse sea-captain, 'a surly, vulgar and disagreeable fellow' stands scarcely any higher as regards his way of speaking. — Then comes the *cockney family Braughton*. The father [Mr. Br.] is married to a 'chandler's shop woman'. He has a son [Br.], 'a young fellow of twenty years of age, weak in his understanding' and two daughters: the eldest [Miss Br.] looks 'illtempered and conceited', the younger, Miss Polly [Miss P] is 'very foolish, very ignorant'. The speech of Br. is to be looked upon as really vulgar, and that of his sisters as very careless, to say the least of it. — Furthermore we have *Mr. Brown* 'a young, awkward and rather simple swain', represented as anything but a gentleman. — In quoting an expression, etc. used by any of the above mentioned characters I have always indicated the speaker. This distinctive procedure I have found superfluous with regard to the other persons introduced, as their language seems exclusively to belong to, and characterize

DEFOE, The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe, etc. 1719 [RC II].
 ——, Serious Reflections, etc., 1720 [Ser. Refl.].
 ——, The Life, etc. of Captain Singleton, 1720 [CS].¹
 ——, The Fortunes, etc. of Moll Flanders, 1722 [MF].²
 ——, A Journal of the Plague Year, etc., 1722 [PY].³
 ——, The Compleat English Gentleman, ed. from the author's auto-graphic manuscript, by Karl D. Bülbring, 1890 [CG].⁴
 ——, Of Royall Educacion, etc., ed. by Karl D. Bülbring, 1895 [RED].⁵
 DRYDEN, Prose works, ed. by F. M. Arnold, 1903.
 ——, With introduction and notes ed. by G. E. Eliot, 1898.
 ——, Essay of Dramatic Poesy, ed. by D. N. Smith, 1900.
 THE SPECTATOR, the fifth ed. (ed. Tonson), 1720 [Sp.].⁶
 STEELE, Selections ed. by L. E. Steele, 1896 [Steele Sel.].
 ——, Essays ed. by L. E. Steele, 1902 [Steele Ess.].
 SWIFT, A Tale of a 'Tub, etc., second ed., 1704 [TT].
 ——, 'Polite conversation' (ed. W. Scott), 1883 [PC].⁷
 the speech of the well bred and educated classes of the day. A single exception makes *Lady Louisa* [Ly. L], who speaks a very slipshod English, even from an 18th c. point of view.

¹ First ed. publ. June 4, 1720. — ² First ed. publ. Jan. 27, 1722. —

³ First ed. publ. March 17, 1722. — As I have not been able to find that the lang. of CS and MF differs from that of PY, for inst., I have only cited some stray examples from the first few pages of these works.

⁴ Though Defoe in many ways portrays the great want of education amongst the 'untaught gentry', I cannot find that he has aimed at giving any vulgar tone to their speech, at least from a linguistic point of view. This will become apparent if we, for inst., go over the 'warm discourse about learning and wit' (p. 44 ff; cf. p. 124 ff.) between the two brothers, the elder represented as an uneducated country gentleman, the younger as educated at the University.

⁵ My quotations from RED. (a fragmentary treatise of 36 pp.) are very scanty.

⁶ Most of the papers from which quotations are taken are written by Addison, as can be seen from the signature, Addison usually signing his contributions with one of the following initials C, L, I, O. When a quotation is taken out of a number not written by Addison, this will gen. be called attention to.

⁷ I regret not having been able in this case, either to obtain the orig. ed. of 1738, or the reprint ed. by SAINTSBURY. — As regards the purpose of the pamphlet, which is much the same as that of Defoe's CG, and esp. the general character of its language, see SCOTT's preface to it in the ed. used by me; SHAW 948 and STORM 925, 948 also for the title. — Quotations from PC are gen. given only in such cases where the lang. seems to differ from that of other contemp. works which may be considered as representative of the standard English of that date.

SWIFT, Selections from his Works, ed. by H. Craik, 2 vols., 1893
 [Craik Sw.]
 ——, Unpublished Letters of Dean Swift, ed. by G. Birbeck Hill,
 1899 [Sw. Let.].
 THE TATLER (ed. Gosling), 1720 [Ta.].

General remark on the quotations. In the quotations the figures (e. g. 56) refer to a certain *page*; in *Sw. Let.*, however, they denote a certain *letter*. — When two sets of figures are used (e. g. 56. 2) they indicate in *RC* p. and l.; in quotations from *Sp.* and *Ta.* the first denotes the number of the paper, the second the paragraph in the resp. ed. — In *Fr.* the Roman number refers to the part, the Arabic to the page.

2. Editions of Robinson Crusoe I.

The *editio princeps* [RC] — marked in the British Museum catalogue: C. 30. f. 6—8.¹ — of

¹ Three parts; the second and third parts contain RC II and Ser. Refl.

THE
L I F E
AND
STRANGE SURPRIZING
ADVENTURES
OF
ROBINSON CRUSOE,
Of YORK MARINER:

Who lived Eight and Twenty Years,
all alone in an un-inhabited Island on the
Coast of AMERICA, near the Mouth of
the Great River of OROONOQUE;

Having been cast on Shore by Shipwreck, where-
in all the Men perished but himself.

W I T H
An Account how he was at last as strangely deli-
ver'd by PYRATES.

Written by Himself.

L O N D O N;
Printed for W. TAYLOR at the Ship in Pater-Noster-
Row. MDCCXIX.

Title page to the first edition of Robinson Crusoe. 4/5 size.

was registered at Stationers' Hall on the 23rd of April 1719, and it was also published by William Taylor 'at the Ship in Pater-Noster-Row' on the 25th of the same month.

The volume is in octavo, of 364 pages, title page and preface (2 leaves) not included. On the page opposite the title there is a rude copper plate engraving,¹ in which Crusoe is represented standing on the sea-shore in his 'short Jacket of Goat-Skin ... and a Pair of open-knee'd Breeches of the same: Stockings and Shoes I had none' (RC 176). He carries a big gun on each shoulder, a pistol is stuck in his belt, and an enormous basket-hilted sword hanging from his left hip. Far in the background of the engraving a ship is seen rolling in a rough sea. At the foot is written *Clark & Pine S. C.* The second part of the last page contains 12 lines Errata.²

In the *Preface* where Defoe masquerades as editor himself, he holds forth the excellent qualities of his work in terms such as: 'The Story is told with Modesty, with Seriousness, and with a religious Application of Events to the Uses to which wise Men always apply them (viz.) to the Instruction of others and to justify and honour the Wisdom of Providence,' and expresses at last as his opinion that 'he thinks, without farther Compliment to the World, he does them a great Service in the Publication'.

The immediate and enormous success of the book shows that he was quite right in his suppositions.³ Already on May 12th 'The Second Edition' [B] was published which, with some small corrections and changes, is only a reprint page by page from A.

Ed. B.

¹ A facsimile reprint of this frontispiece is to be found in THOMAS WRIGHT's *Life of Defoe*.

² These Errata, being only a small portion of the great number extant, are all corrected in B.

³ Those who want to enter upon any closer study of the hundreds, nay thousands of more or less strictly original editions, translations, imitations and the like, which became a consequence of the enormous success of the book in England, I refer to ULLRICH: *Robinson und Robinsonaden*.

As regards the sequence of lines, differences occur, though not to any very great extent, e. g. 71.16—36; 139.20—23; 276.29—30, etc. — For further examples see p. XXXVII. — Nevertheless, it will be observed that in setting up B, the printer managed, practically always, to make the corresponding pages agree as regards the end-words. Only in two or three cases have I noticed some slight differences: pp. 215—216; 264—265; 320—321.

Upon the title page, moreover, there appears for the first time the emblem of the publisher, *a ship* with the English merchant flag astern and the Union Jack on the mizzen-mast.

Though the differences in text between A and B will generally be called attention to in their respective places, I shall here give a

Comprehensive survey of the different readings of A and B.

[In this list I have not considered it either necessary or desirable to include any examples of the many obvious misprints (cf. p. XV) in A, generally corrected in B, e. g. *inagast* > *against* 2.5; *were* > *where* 200.23, etc. etc. — a few, however, are left in B, e. g. *Ingeino* 38.37, *a State Health* of (of health) 43.28 — or such as are to be found in B, but not in A, e. g. *clam* < *calm* 8.31, *the* < *they*, 191.19, etc. etc. This also applies to the exceedingly great number of purely orthographical dissimilarities existing between A and B. Such examples are to be found in the general text-survey on pp. XXXVI—XXXVII].

- 6.27 (A) the *miserablest* > (B) *most miserablest*;
- 9.25 applying my self to *Drink* > to *Drinking*;
- 9.34 *hardned* > *harden'd*;
- 23.3 *Patroon* > *Patron* (= 23.22, 25; 28.27; 32.35);
- 24.8 a Pound and half > and a half;
- 25.20 *ha'* been > *have* (= 32.33; 50.5).

32.7 we got *of* > *off* (= 127.25);
 42.3 I thought my *Fortunes* made > *Fortune*;
 46.1 *Intrest* > *Interest*:
 49.4 looking upon one another > one upon another;
 51.14 to *raise* my self > *rise*;
 54.15 I resolv'd to *set* all Night and > *sit*;
 57.18 these I fill'd with *Provision* > *Provisions*;
 78.7 a Year and a Half > and half;
 79.30 a Foot and Half > and a Half;
 84.10 *learn'd* > *learnt* (= 98.14, 114.24, 122.18);
 87.28 I lam'd another so as that > so that;
 93.23 I *run* > *ran* == 165.34;
 100.21 have *builded* > *built*;
 109.6 I *rise* > *rose*;
 119.13 to *rend* Improbable > *render*;
 122.26 there *was* thirty Stalks > *were*;
 128.30 *ventrous* > *venturous*;
 131.14 *rendred* > *renderd*;
 132.2 the 30th, of *Sept.* > the 30th of *September*;
 138.26 a good Quantity *for* Store > *of*;
 145.31 *wondred* > *wondered*;
 156.22 no *Beast* > *Beasts*:
 157.1 my Ink had been gone some time > *for* some time;
 157.25 26 *Year* > *Years*;
 160.9 it kept *off* > *of*;
 166.3 Thieves just a *going* to murther > just *going* to murder;
 170.16 *Earthen* Ware > *Earthern*;
 177.31; 191.8 *monstrous* > *monstruous*;
 178.20 came *nearer* > *near*;
 182.35 a great way *off* of it > *off* it;
 183.15 'twas > *it was*;
 185.2 *who* Heaven thought > *whom*;
 204.14 in *Principle* > *Principles*:
 205.1 I *gave* > *give*;
 209.18 But this *is* by the by > But this by the By;
 211.32 *Entrance* > *Enterance*;
 211.20 *100* thousand > *a hundred*; cf.
 270.21 *six and twenty* Years > *26*;

212.24 Giants which *are* said > *were*:
 213.30 I *had* brought > I brought:
 213.37 Kids *who* I taught > *which*:
 222.24 *rendred* > *render'd*:
 223.16 *drown-* *ded* > *drown'd*:
 225.8 the Flood *come* on > *came*:
 228.9 *fastned* > *fasten'd*:
 228.17 in the *Chest* > *Chests*:
 229.37 but my unlucky Head > but */* my:
 230.2 all *this* two Years > *the*:
 230.17 *has* plac'd > *hath*:
 234.1 to reach and not *to* be attempted > not be:
 234.26 what I *long'd* for > *long*:
 241.25 The Savage *who* I knock'd down > *whom*:
 249.10 And (*2d*) that > And *2d/y*, That:
 253.24 *meant* > *mean'd* (= 255.26,33.34.35):
 253.30 how *came* you > *come*:
 256.23 All Things *do* say O to him > *said*:
 256.37 *listned* > *listen'd*:
 257.31 they *spake* > *spoke*:
 257.32 *entred* > *enter'd*:
 258.1 to delude Mankind to *his* Ruine > *their* Ruin:
 258.22 his dreadful *Nature* to Sin > *Aversion*:
 261.15 for ought I *knew* > *know*:
 262.1 I apply'd my self *in* Reading > *to*:
 262.4 *Questionings* > *Questions*:
 264.18 what *become* of them > *became*:
 268.27 he takes it up hastily, *comes* and gives > hastily, and:
 272.23 Water enough to *flet* in > *float*:
 278.2 they *run* > *ran*:
 282.23 *an* Hour > *a*:
 304.21 have *wakned* > *waken'd*:
 306.5 this was at *an* End > *at* *End*:
 314.34 joyn *sincere* > *sincerely*:
 315.35 *over* the same thing > the same thing *over*:
 316.1 My Men would fain have me *given* them Leave
 to > *give*:
 332.31 *Providore* > *Provedidore*:

334.3 *registered* > *register'd*;
 340.21 a *further Supply* > *farther*;
 341.17 *according* I *prepar'd* > *accordingly*;
 345.24 we were armed to protect *our selves* > *us*;
 346.13 turning to *his* left > *the*;
 347.6 being next *me* > *next to me*;
 351.10 the Bear *begin* > *began*;
 352.21 he *came* > *come*;
 360.11 *severely cold* > *severe cold*.

These deviations, in many respects very important from a linguistic point of view, raise of course the question as to their origin. The best means of determining the matter will, I think, be to undertake a comparative examination of Defoe's autograph MS of CG and a printed proof sheet containing the beginning of the work, preserved together with the MS; cf. CG p. X. — In the MS Defoe hardly ever puts any *punctuation marks*, and never uses any *hyphen* or *apostrophe* in the Saxon genitive; before *t* (for *ed*) in verbs, on the contrary, as *puff't*, *suck't*, *burn't*, *furnish't*, *pass't*, etc., and such modes of writing as *kno'*, *thro'* (throw) 227, etc., the apostrophe occurs very frequently; *capitals* are used quite at random, a small letter being even written after a full stop. In the printed sheet, on the other hand, these peculiarities are corrected in agreement with the commonly accepted style of the time. — The *final e* after *v* is very frequently omitted:¹ *believ*, *giv*, *preserv*, etc. (cf. *som*); in other cases we find it used contrary to the proof: *baronet*, *dark*, *mobbe*; *customes*, *alwayes*, *dayes*, *sayes*, *saies*; *translat*ing, *writ*ing, etc. — Such spellings as *bodyes*, *capascityes*;² *infirmitys*, *ladys*, etc. are no less common than the use of *ci* instead of *ti*, which never occurs in R C: *crudicion*, *revelacion* and *inspiration* 157, *actions*, his imperfections are no *imperfeccions* 185. — The *doubling of the final consonant* is certainly

¹ In R C only *negativ*, *positiv* once p. 77.21 (B *-ive*).

² In R C I have only found a single similar inst. left: *Cryes* 27.37 (B *Cries*). — In Sw. Let. *Cherryes*, *Toryes*, *carryes*, *copyes*, etc. are equally common as *arrivall*, *counsell*, *admitt*, *att*, *writt*, etc. — In his printed works, on the contrary, similar spellings hardly ever occur.

found in the proof, but its occurrence can in no way be compared with its frequency in the MS, e. g. *naturall, rascall, farr, fitt, regrett*, etc. etc.

As in all the above adduced cases the orthography of R C practically agrees with that of the printed proof, I believe one may safely infer that at least in these cases the differences in spelling existing between A and the MS of CG are to be ascribed wholly to the printers.¹ The same inference may be drawn regarding the very great number of instances (cf. p. XXXVII) where B has changed the orthography of A and esp. in such cases where this differs from that of CG.

But even in other more important respects the MS and the proof have different readings, e. g. p. 21: the nations *are* > *is*; the *degenerated* race > *degenerate*: p. 22: *antient history*: instead of this the print has a long stroke, etc. — Finally some alterations made in the text of the printed proof such as p. 11, *the Born Gentleman, in the Common, or Modern, or Present Acceptation of the Word* in the MS, is corrected in the printed sheet to *the Gentleman born* and the words *or Modern, or Present* are struck out and marked for deletion; — *I matter not* p. 11 and *Shines without Beams* p. 20, have by the corrector been altered to *I value not* and *Fair without Beams* respectively. — These corrections, not in Defoe's handwriting, show better than the former textual differences, as regards CG at least, the correctors' highhanded way of dealing with the MSS sent in for printing.²

¹ That this opinion is really in agreement with the then prevailing printing practice, is confirmed by a statement in DYCHE against the spelling of the time (e. g.: *-ck*, *-our*, etc.) beginning as follows: 'By the leave of my good Friends, the Printers and Correctors of the Press, I would propose'... and DRYDEN complains of the 'false pointings' of the printers he 'has to answer for'. — Cf. VAN DAM & STOFFEL: *William Shakespeare, Prosody and Text* (1900) p. 273 ff. and *Chapters on English Printing*, etc. (1550—1700), 1902; Est. 29.440.

² Swift's works suffered from the same arbitrary methods of correction. On seeing his *Travels* in print he laments (Sw. Let. 46) that 'it hath been mangled in the press, for in some parts it doth not seem of a piece'. — In another letter to Pope (Nov. 17, 1726) he repeats this, saying he 'observed several passages which appear to be patched and altered, and the style of a different sort'...

The facts adduced above certainly give us no immediate information on the point whether Defoe was responsible for the textual differences between A and B, or not. But if one may take for granted that the compositors, proof-readers, etc. of R C played the same part as those of C G, I think one cannot but conjecture that much of what we find in A (and B) is not to be looked upon as extant in Defoe's M.S. — One needs, moreover, only to remember Defoe's unceasing political activity, his businesslike way of writing and his simply marvellous productivity during the time immediately subsequent to the appearance of R C, to be fully persuaded that Defoe in his busy life had no time left for such a weary and time-consuming task as proof-reading, far less for superintending the publishing of the several reprints of R C, appearing with hardly a month's interval between them.¹

But if these variations cannot be ascribed to Defoe himself, how are they to be explained? I think this will be somewhat difficult question to give a decided answer to. — For various reasons,² however, the most plausible explanation seems to be that, when B was being reprinted, it was set up from a copy of A where the proof-readers, probably also the compositors, corrected most of the misprints and some modes of spelling, esp. such as probably corresponded with Defoe's M.S. — The differences enumerated on page XVI ff. may indeed be explained in the same manner. But I think that the following alternative deserves consideration: that A was collated with, and corrected in agreement with the readings of Defoe's own M.S., which for some reason or other had been altered in A; and it was from this revised copy that B was then set up. This has been one of the reasons for my usually giving the reading of B beside that of A. — A similar supposition can hardly be made, I think, to explain the text differences between A (B) and the third, fourth and

¹ For particulars see LEE's preface in L; ULLRICH p. 8 and WRIGHT'S *Life* pp. 405—427 containing a list of Defoe's works, 254 entries; cf. also my Introduction p. 6.

² Cf. C G p. XVII and WRIGHT *Life of D.* pp. 403—405 where specimens of Defoe's handwriting are given.

following editions. (For dates of publication see references in note 1, p. XXI). As far as they are concerned they may have an interest of their own. For the study of Defoe's language, however, I think they are of very doubtful value.

Pirated Editions.

It is quite natural that in those days, when the notions of copyright were most vague — if there were any at all — a book with such an enormous success as *RC* should be very often pirated. Thus it was once reprinted at Dublin, and a printer *T. Cox at the Amsterdam Coffee House* in London published before August 7 a mutilated abridgment of the famous book. On account of this unauthorized reprint the legitimate publisher in an advertisement in the *St. James's Post* of August 7 warned the public against that issue, to which the printer answered in an article in *The Flying Post* of Oct. 29; the article is full of recriminations, but at all events it is rather valuable, as it contains a confirmation that Defoe is the real author of the book, a fact which later on was often doubted, as all the ed. only state on the title page: 'Written by himself'¹ Another protest against this illegitimate abridging of the book is found in the Preface of *The Farther Adventures* (published only twelve days after the issue of the fourth ed. of Part I) which he says will be in every way as profitable and diverting; 'and this makes the abridging this Work as scandalous, as it is knavish and ridiculous' and goes on, almost forgetting his editorial character: 'The Injury these Men do the Proprietor of this Work is a Practice all honest Men abhor; and he believes he may challenge them to shew the Difference between that and Robbing on the Highway, or Breaking open a House'.

'If they can't shew any Difference in the Crime, they will find it hard to shew why there should be any Difference in the Punishment: And he will answer for it, that nothing shall be wanting on his Part, to do them Justice.'

¹ Cf. L p. IX.

Another pirated edition of the story came out in successive numbers of a wretchedly printed periodical publication entitled *The Original London Post or Heathcot's Intelligence*,¹ *Being a Collection of the Freshest Advices Foreign and Domestick* between Friday, October 7, 1719 and October 20, 1720. This is a collection consisting of the first leaves of each number from 125 to 289 taken out and bound together, containing the Life of R. C. part I and II.² -- It is a very common mistake, based on the statement of the bibliographer Dibdin, found even in Storm p. 920, (though even Chalmers, and after him Wilson, have proved Dibdin's statement to be an error) to consider this the original edition. As is shown above (p. XV) the genuine original of RC was published already on April 25, 1719, and moreover '*The Farther Adventures*' had long been published before being reprinted in Heathcot's Intelligence.

Later reprints.

In the *Preliminary* of L the publisher tells the readers of his edition that 'after making a careful examination of every accessible reprint of importance from 1719 down to the present time, great was his surprise to find that not one of the hundreds of so called *revised editions* had given the correct text of the Author, but had, to all appearance, copied from each other, adding a few variations here and there to give an air of originality.'

I cannot quite decide how far this statement of the publisher is to be trusted, but I am sure there is much truth in it, judging from my own investigations in this respect.

Both in the British Museum and in libraries here in Sweden I have had an opportunity of examining a very great number of reprints, many of them 'with illustrations'

¹ A facsimile of the frontispiece is given in A. WHERRY'S *Daniel Defoe* (Bell's Miniature Series of Great Writers).

² The principal interest in these leaves consists, no doubt, in their being the first serial publication in the English language.

and 'engravings', and all of them are alike at least in the one respect: *they differ all more or less from the original edition*, which no doubt arises from the fact that most modern editions are only reprintings from reprints, so that error has been added to error.

These variations do not extend to the spelling only, which is almost always modernized, but in many cases forms and expressions that the publishers may have found old-fashioned, have without further ado been 'corrected' or 'revised' to suit the modern usage of language.¹

To these kinds of editions where, of course, there is not the slightest intimation given as to the high-handed way of changing the text of the original edition, I think one can reckon the editions published by COOKE 'embellished with engravings'. London probably 1793, and another published by TAUCHNITZ in the *Collection of British Authors*, Leipzig 1845 [T].

Ed. Tauchnitz [T].

In the latter edition, as in the whole collection, which is intended for the general public, the spelling is altogether modernized. Cooke, on the contrary, probably to make his readers believe that his text agrees with the original edition, has put in a capital letter or an apostrophized pret. (pa. pple.) form here and there², e. g. *Parent 37.25, liv'd 37.12*³, etc. etc.

As, for the sake of brevity, I shall refer to further differences between A and T in my examining the text of R, I will here confine myself to giving some few cases, where Cooke and T (L and R) have altered the original text.⁴

¹ I consider it lying outside my province to enter upon any investigation of the quite modernized texts of especially *German* and *French school editions* (see STORM 658 ff.): »für den schul- und privatgebrauch eingerichtet H. LÖWE, Halle 1882; — »die Sprache ist nur da geändert, wo sie die grammatische Sicherheit des Schülers zu gefährden schien; die Formenlehre muss auf dieser Stufe korrect sein» KARL FOTH, Leipzig 1893; — »nous avons du faire subir au texte original de de Foe des changements nombreux» (DOUGLAS GIBB, Paris 1892). — As an ex. of similar *Engl. editions for the use of schools, with explanatory notes* I can mention that published by W. and R. CHAMBERS, L. 1884.

² Cf. ed. LEE (p. XXX).

³ Page and line refer to COOKE.

⁴ On an edition by ROUTLEDGE see below p. 114.

2.1 Brothers, one of which was Lieutenant > *whom* was a **Ed. Cooke.**¹ lieutenant 5:

3.21 he *bid* > *hade* 6 = T 2;

5.19 I was sincerely *affected* > *afflicted* 8:

8.34 my Companion who had entic'd me *comes* > *came* 11:

22.15 a hand: 23.32,33 a Hundred, a Hatchet, a Hammer > an 23,24:

22.33 *Fuzes* > *fusils* 23:

24.2 our Guns are on board > all on board 24:

29.23 and *did not* exactly *know* > and *not* exactly *knowing* 21:

31.17 I shot him *into* the Head > *in* 30 = T 22;

31.18 I had the Pleasure to see him drop, and *make* but little Noise, *but lay* struggling for Life > *making* . . . *he lay* 30: T 22 *but lie*:

34 33 it swam *on* Shore > *to the* shore 33:

37.7 an inexpressible Joy, *that* any one will believe > *joy*, anyone 35: T 26 *which*:

37.24 *those* things > *these* things 36:

39.5 how they *grew* rich > *got* 28:

39.31 I *was gotten* into an Employment > I *had got* 28:

40.23 the Life *which* I led > *life* I led 38;

40.30 the Ship remained there providing *his* Loading *his* Voyage > *her* 38:

41.8 if it *come* safe . . . *miscarry* > *comes* . . . *miscarries* 39:

41.11 *so wholesom* Advice > *such wholesome* Advice 39:

41.19 The *Portugal* Captain > *Portuguese* 39:

41.25 a Merchant *at* London > *in* 39:

41.26 who *represented* it to > *presented* 39: etc. etc.

6.27 the *miserablest* (B most miserablest) > *most miserable* 4; **Ed. Tauchnitz.**²

66.22 *cross* > *across* 47 = R 62:

¹ This edition from the latter part of the 18th cent. has been mentioned here to show that there was no difference between the reprints of the 18th and 19th cent. with respect to their reliability. Cf. pp. XXXVI and 2. — With this idea in view I hope that the number of examples quoted will not be considered too numerous.

² In the following list only a comparatively small number of instances is given, and generally only such as will be dealt with below.

90.2 I was at a great Loss for *Candle* > candles 64: cf.
 358.9 I order'd our last *Pistol* to be fir'd off in one Volley
 > *pistols* 250;
 99.33 had *blow'd* > *blowen* 71;
 183.2 what Marks *was* there > *were* 129 = L 139;
 200.1 if there *was* twenty > *were* 140;
 197.13 to hear *of* it > hear it 139;
 203.31, 331.37 *off* of my Design > *off* 143, 232;
 217.2, 311.13 I *gat* > *got* 152, 218;
 223.13 he *forbid* > *forbade* 156;
 245.16 I *takes* > *took* 172 = L 184;
 249.18 I *spake* > *spoke* 175;
 261.8, 301.5 it *set* > *sat* 183, 211;
 277.32, 352.16 he *see* > *saw* 195, 246;
 295.5 I *see* > *saw* 207 = L 221;
 317.19, (230.2) *this* (B *the*) two Hours > *these* 222;
 323.14 two of the *Clock* > two *o'clock* 226 = L 242;
 330.18 *Barco-Longo*.> *long-boat* 231;
 346.10 *being* pass'd two Rivers > *having* 242;
 350.9 the *Stone* > the *blow* 245, etc. etc.

Another type of editions of RC may be said to be represented by the first volume of *Romances and Narratives by Daniel Defoe*, edited by G. A. AITKEN, in sixteen volumes, L. 1895.

This work, which, no doubt, is the only complete collection of Defoe's romances and narratives, looks at first sight very trustworthy indeed, being neatly printed on very fine paper and adorned with really tasteful and artistic illustrations.¹

And this good first impression of the reliability of the book is still more heightened by the editor's intimation that 'great care has been bestowed upon the text', and that 'the first editions have been carefully followed, a course which was the more needful in view of the extraordinarily corrupt text of all the modern reprints of some of the works'.

¹ 'This Library Edition (is) limited to Five Hundred Copies' at 4/6 per volume, being now out of print, a cheaper reprint has been issued at 2/6 per vol.

In one respect, however, he is candid enough to tell us that he has undertaken some corrections of the first edition, referring, however, only to 'Defoe's spelling and punctuation (or rather that of his printers, for he seems to have been too busy to correct his proof-sheets)', which, he says, are often erratic, and therefore 'such slight corrections as modern conventions render necessary have been made in these respects'. But I am sorry to say everybody would be greatly mistaken and disappointed in believing that the editor, except for these 'slight corrections', has really 'carefully followed the first editions'. — The following illustrations will, I think, give a good idea of the real circumstances of the case.

Sometimes he changes letters into numbers or vice versa, e. g.:

121.23 *September the thirtieth* > *Sept. 30* 114;
331.20 *two hundred Pounds Sterling* > *£ 200* sterling 312.

Most of the phenomena mentioned under the heading *Some Phonological Notes* (see p. 24 ff.), and further such word-forms as are now more or less obsolete in P E (these will be dealt with in Part II of this treatise) are simply 'corrected' in R. In many instances this is also applicable to L and T. For example:

147.14 *Africk* > *Africa* 138;
47.26 *Amozones* > *Amazon* 45;
43.32 *Brasilo* > *Brazils* 41;
62.35 *hoise* > *hoist* 59 == L 47, T 45;
177.18 *Moletta* > *mulatto* 166 == L 134, T 125;
47.26 *Oronoque* > *Orinoco* 45;
318.23 *uninhabitated* > *uninhabited* 300 == T 223, etc.

The old plurals *Fathom*, *Foot*, *Mile*, *Pound*, *Tun*, *Year* are always changed into the modern forms.

Though he does not agree with T in changing *ye 300.12* into *you*, the two ed. coincide however in always altering '*em*' into '*them*', quite as L. — The acc. form of the rel. pron. *who* is, as far as I can see, always corrected into *whom*. —

The indefinite pronoun *other* is sometimes kept 72.31; 242.26, 347.8; but in other cases, e. g. 111.14; 317.12 it is corrected into the modern *the other* (L, T always *the other*). The same is the case with the old plural form *other*.

Regarding the verb forms the text of A has been subjected to the most thorough revision. I will confine myself to pointing out here only a comparatively small number of the instances which I have observed.

25.3 he *rise* > *rose* 23 = L 18, T 18;
 32.36 they *run* > *ran* 31 = L 24, T 23;
 51.35 I *strook* > *struck* 49 = L 37, T 37.
 65.10 *overladen* > *overladen* 61 = L 50, T 46;
 97.30 was *broke* > *broken* 91;
 110.35 I *drunk* > *drank* 104 = T 78;
 150.16 have *began* > *begun* 141 = T 106;
 277.32 he *see* > *sees* 261 = K 238;
 278.8 *loaden* > *loaded* 261 = L 209;
 278.26 I *see* > *saw* 262 = L 209, T 196;
 281.12 had *took* > *take* 265 = T 197;
 352.16 the Bear *see* > *sees* 331: etc. etc.

It is, moreover, quite obvious that in cases where A and B differ, the editor's statement, that 'the first edition has been carefully followed', is inaccurate: in most cases, e. g. 54.15, 109.6, 122.26, 165.34, 230.17, 241.25, 272.23, 351.10, etc. etc. the reading of B has been adopted. — In all these instances and many others, L and T agree with R.

*

I now proceed to examine another kind of editions, viz. such as are represented to be 'careful' reprints of the original edition. — In this category I have not found sufficient reason to enter upon any closer examination of such editions as claim either to be '*carefully compared with the original edition of 1719*' like the one 'illustrated in oil-colours by Kronheim, L. 1864', or '*carefully reprinted from the original edition*' (*The Household Robinson Crusoe*, L. 1871), or '*Newly*

edited after the original editions, with 20 illustrations by Kauffman (T. Fisher Unwin, L. 1884) or '*from the Author's Edition 1719, illustrated by C. Browne*' (Blackie, L. 1884), as the spelling, etc. in them has always been modernized.

There are, however, three of these 'carefully reprinted' editions that I have thought fit to subject to closer examination, among other reasons especially because Storm in his '*Englische Philologie*' p. 920 ff. gives some rather misleading information about them.

Of these I will first consider *The Life*, etc. *Now first Ed. Lee [L]. correctly reprinted from the original edition of 1719. With an introduction by WILLIAM LEE, London 1869, etc. [L].*

As I have mentioned above, the publisher of L has strongly, and rightly so, criticized the reprints of RC. He is careful to let us know that he is not like *other men*, and to inform us of the great value and reliability of his own publication, as compared with 'every other accessible reprint from 1719 down to the present time', and he therefore tells us that 'by the kindness of Mr. Lee, a copy of the very valuable and rare first edition in two vol., 1719, has been deposited with the printers during the progress of the work through the press, and there, in a glass case, every word and letter(!) have been examined in preparing the present edition, which is believed to represent the only(!) perfect text of Defoe's narrative since the time of its Author'.

After these big promises, one might expect to find a reprint closely following 'the text of the Author'. But indeed, 'great is our surprize' to find that this edition is far less to be trusted, and to be received with much more suspicion than any of all those 'carefully reprinted from the original edition', that I have examined.

Storm (p. 921) expresses his just indignation at L's way of fulfilling his big promises, but as his statements do not quite agree with the facts, I shall here endeavour to show how matters really stand.

As I have shown previously, Storm's review of the editions of RC is based on the wrong hypothesis that *Heathcot's Intelligence* should be the first issue of the work. But

even if this were the case, Storm's remark that 'Lee still-schweigend die Schreibung durchweg modernisiert hat' is misleading. It is quite true that L generally alters the spelling of A (and B); but in many cases he retains orthographical peculiarities and characteristics current in printing in the earlier part of the 18th cent. Thus, for example, he sometimes leaves out the apostrophe in the genitive, but occasionally retains the apostrophized pret. and pa. pple. e. g.:

L 101 apply'd, occur'd, open'd.

271 (last page) destroy'd, enter'd, famish'd, master'd, perform'd, renew'd, ruin'd, reserv'd, etc.

One might perhaps ascribe such archaisms as these only to an oversight of the printer, as in most cases similar forms are modernized. But in my opinion they ought to be looked upon as a mere sham, and this supposition is still further confirmed by his constant use of italics and capitals, which, no doubt, he considered to be the cheapest and most convenient way to give the uninitiated public the impression that the ed. is really reprinted 'every word and letter' from the original edition of 1719.

And his conscientiousness in these respects is so great that, in spite of much hunting for divergencies, I must admit I have not found a single one. — To alter a word in any other respect whatever, he never scruples; but, to leave out a capital — never, e. g.:

177.18 *Moletta* (adj.) > *Mulatto* (134.33):¹ 300.37 *Two a Clock*
 > *Two o'Clock* (226.15); 23.1 *Antient* > *Ancient* (17.4);
 302.3 *Cloath'd* > *Clothed* (227.7); 312.22 *Jobb* > *Job*
 (235.10).

In my previous review of T and R I have pointed out at the same time the readings of L, as far as they differ from A (and B). Here are further contributions to show L's method of examining 'every word and letter':

¹ The figures in parenthesis refer to L.

87.28, 134.28 *catch'd* > *caught* 67, 102:
 24.27 *catcht* is however retained as *catched* 18:
 258.22 his *Nature* (B *Aversion*) to Sin > *Antipathy* 194:
 278.14 *loaden* > *laden* 209:
 347.26 there *was* not such a Few > *were* 250:
 350.14 *run* > *ran* 261, etc.

Now in Ullrich (p. 18) the following statement concerning L is to be found: 'Wohl die erste Ausgabe, die wirklich auf den Text des Originals von 1719 zurückgeht, was, in Verbindung mit einer wertvollen Einleitung des Defoe-Biographen William Lee und dem äusserst billigen Preise sie zur weitester Verbreitung empfiebt...' In consideration of the facts adduced above it will at once be obvious that this remark must be regarded as absolutely unreliable and misleading.

*

The only two editions that at least approximately fulfil the usual, but never trustworthy, promise of being 'edited after the original editions' or the like, are those published by Macmillan & Co. One is entitled *Robinson Crusoe, edited after the original editions by J. W. CLARK, M. A.*, L. 1866, etc. [C]. In the preface¹ the editor tells us that his 'aim has been to reproduce faithfully the original text. The edition used to print from was that of 1719, but I have collated it with other editions. I have in no case modernized the spelling or phraseology. The Archaisms', he goes on, 'are hardly ever such as to render the meaning doubtful, even to the ordinary reader, and it has appeared to me likely to prove useful and interesting to young and old in modern times to have our English Classics preserved in all their integrity in popular editions such as this aims to be'.

The other, *The Globe Edition, edited after the original editions. with a biographical introduction by HENRY KINGSLEY* [K]. L. 1868, etc. [K] printed like C in Cambridge by C. J. Clay & Son at the University Press, has exactly the same text as C, the former being reprinted not only page for page,

¹ In K this preface is left out; instead, as will appear from the title, KINGSLEY has written a 'Biographical Introduction' (I—XXI), not in C.

but also line for line and word for word in the same type as C. The only difference being that K has left out the title page and 'The Preface' by Defoe, which, on the other hand, is to be found in C.

Now in L:s 'Preliminary' we read the following rather inappropriate, and, as is usual with L, irresponsible effusion: 'Even the text of a late Edition in the 'Globe Library' must be received with some suspicion when the Editor tells us that he «printed from the edition of 1719 but collated it with *earlier editions!*» which is all nonsense, because there are no editions earlier than 1719.'

Fully aware of the fact that L:s veracity and reliability should only be received with the greatest caution, especially as *there is no such statement to be found in the 'Globe Edition'*. I applied to the publisher, who kindly gave the following information: 'The statement in the edition in the Chandos Classics (= L) refers not to the *Globe Library*, but to the *Golden Treasury* edition, in the first issue of which by a misprint the word *earlier* appeared instead of the word *other*', which is also the reading of my edition 1899.

In my previous textual review of T, R and L, where I have always pointed out the readings of all the other editions, provided that they, in some way or other, differed from A (and B), the letter K is only once to be seen: page XXVIII. As the cases examined amount to hundreds and hundreds, this single difference from the orig. ed being the only one found, I think this is a fair proof of the reliability of the text. This careful way of reprinting is also maintained in purely orthographical matters, the exceedingly rare differences being no doubt due to an oversight of the compositor, e. g.:

deliver'd (title page) > *delivered*; 6.17 *my self* > *myself* (5.20)¹;
 302.3 *Cloath'd* > *cloath'd* (259.13); 361.30 *Providences*
 > *Providence's* (310.16).

Amongst quite accidental over-sights (misprints?) I think one ought also to include 20.3 *entred* > *enter'd* (17) and 11.16

¹ The figures in parenthesis refer to K.

deep loaden > *deeply* (9) especially as in all other cases such forms agree with A, as far as I can see. (Cf. 12.17 *deep* loaden — K.)

These slight differences may also be explained by the statement of the editor in the above mentioned preface to C: 'The edition used to print from was that of 1719 but I have collated it with other editions'. — In any case I have not thought it necessary to try to discover whether he consulted any other editions than A and B, or not.

Regarding K:s (and C:s) relation to these editions at least, this statement of Clark's has proved applicable: in such instances when A and B show different readings, he follows in most cases B. This is especially so, when B uses the more modern forms and expressions as 24.8; 50.5; 54.15; 109.6; 157.25; 166.3; 185.2; 228.9; 257.31; 314.34; 351.10, etc.

In some cases, however, he retains the reading of B, though this is out of use now: e. g. 78.7 (cf. 24.8); 213.17; 225.8; 253.30; 345.24; 352.21, etc.; cf. p. XVI ff.

Quite the same eclectic procedure is used with respect to orthographical text differences, of which I do not think it necessary to give any examples.

Finally it remains for us to investigate if the *Facsimile Re-* The Facsimile
Reprint.
print of the first edition published in 1719: with an introduc-
*tion by AUSTIN DOBSON, L. 1883*¹ really satisfies the claims
one has on a printed work described as a facsimile. — For
this reason I have here and there collated the facsimile with
the editio princeps in the British Museum, and, as will appear
from my list, the dissimilarities are surprisingly numerous,
not only from a purely orthographical point of view, but
also in other respects, and to such an extent as to jeopardize
the use of the volume for linguistic purposes.

Original.

Facsimile.

36.5	suddain	suddam
81.28	and	aud
106.35	I return to	I return

¹ Not mentioned in STORM (1896).

Original.	Facsimile.
108.37 Sallee Man	Sallee man
110.8 open'd	opened
112.12 from	f
114.33 above	about
143.4 two	too
143.8, etc. Earthen	Earthern
148.18 pleas'd	pleased
156.1 had	hath
197.13 Providence	Pravidence
199.21 Gun-powder	Gun-Powder
202.28 Thoughts	Thoughts
210.31 round	ronnd
212.22 carry'd	carried
214.31 particular	Particular
217.0 Marks	marks
219.19 it	if
222.36 wou'd	would
224.25 launch	launn h
225.29 next	Next
226.11 off	aff
232.18 Apprehensions	Apprehensions
246.32 awkwardly	awkwardly
247.15 Wall	wall
248.32 Soveraignty	Soverainty
255.22 there	their
256.10 religious	Religious
256.13 ask'd who	ask'd him who
258.3 Affections	affections
259.16 ever	exer
264.36 make	makes
277.22 They	There
291.37 could	chuld
293.10 contriv'd	contrived
295.32 League	league
296.16 English	<i>English</i>
298.30 outragious	outrageous
343.2 Pilot	Pilate, etc., etc.

In view of these differences I wrote to the publishers for further information as to the copy used by them for their own production, well knowing that there was only a very limited number of first ed. in existence. [Even the famous Bodleian library at Oxford does not possess a first ed., the earliest in its possession being the third and fourth.] The reply was rather disappointing, reading as follows:

'You may take it that our reprint of Robinson Crusoe 1719 is an exact (!!) facsimile of the 1st Ed. in all respects. We cannot now remember whose copy was used in the reprint, for it is 24 years since issue and enquiry has been futile also.'

From Mr. Austin Dobson, however, I have a very important written communication that will show what share he has in the responsibility of the inadvertencies pointed out above:

He writes: '*The facsimile of 1883 was prepared before I was asked to make an introduction to it.*'

This shows as plainly as possible that Mr. Dobson had nothing at all to do with the facsimile itself, and I am quite convinced that the same applies in estimating Lee's relation to L. Without controlling the assertions of the publisher, Mr. Lee wrote his introduction in good faith, relying upon their bona fides. Without this supposition it is quite unaccountable how such a learned and scrupulous student as Lee, after criticizing other mutilated editions rather sharply,¹ could bring himself to lend his name to the following statement (L p. XVI), diverging so greatly from facts: 'I am able to affirm that the present is an exact reproduction from my own copy of the first edition.'

As a final judgment of this facsimile, I think it can be said that it can in no way lay claim to this title. It is after all simply a more or less trustworthy reprint of the first edition, set up with special type and printed on paper specially prepared to suggest the original. Such a proce-

¹ 'Scarcely any work has been more mutilated by printers; and there is reason to doubt whether, in modern times, the original has ever been reprinted verbatim.'

dure cannot, I think, but be termed highly unfair which is not lessened by the unreasonably high price (10/6) the publisher sees fit to charge for it.

The above examination of the texts of Cooke, T, R, L, etc., and also with due reservation of K (C) and the so called Facsimile will more than sufficiently show that they are in no way to be trusted and practically useless from a linguistic point of view. — This is no special characteristic of the text either of Robinson Crusoe or of Defoe's works in general. In the British Museum I have had the opportunity of collating a very great number of 18th and 19th century reprints with the original editions, and though I consider it outside the scope of my present treatise to detail the discrepancies in justification of my opinion, I hope the reader will trust my statement, that these reprints are of exactly the same nature as those of RC. The statements and results arrived at by authors like Borst, Uhrström, Widholm, etc. using such modern reprints without going to the trouble of comparing them with the original editions, are consequently more or less valueless.

* * *

To conclude this section I now proceed to give a short survey of the differences between the texts examined. The following are the passages collated:

I. A 166 = K 142, L 125, R 155, T 117. They who know what it is to have a *Reprise*¹ brought to them upon the *Ladder*,¹ or to be rescued from *Thieves*¹ just *a going*² to *murther*³ them, or, who have been in *such like*⁴ Extremities, may guess what my present *Surprise*⁵ of Joy was, and how gladly I put my Boat into the Stream of this Eddy, and the Wind also *freshning*,⁶ how gladly I spread my Sail to it, running *clearfully*⁷ before the Wind, and with a strong Tide or Eddy under *Eoot*.⁸ This Eddy *carryed*⁹ me . . .

II. A 195 = K 167, L 147, R 183, T 137. I was so astonish'd¹⁰ with the Sight of these Things, | that I entertain'd¹¹ no *Notions*¹² of any Danger to my | self¹³ from it for a long while; All¹¹ my *Apprehensions*¹⁵ were bury'd¹⁶ in | the Thoughts of such a Pitch of in¹⁷ human, hellish Brutality, and the Horror of the *De*¹⁸generacy of *Humane*¹⁹ Nature; which though I had²⁰ heard of often, yet I never had so near a View of before; in short, I turn'd²¹ away my Face from the horrid Spectacle; my Stomach grew sick, and I was |²² just at the Point of Fainting, when Nature dis- | charg'd the Disorder from my Stomach; and ha- | ving vomited with an uncommon Violence, I was | a little reliev'd; but cou'd²³ not bear to stay in the Place a Moment: so I gat²⁴ me up the Hill again | with all the Speed I cou'd²³ and walk'd²⁵ on towards my own Habitation.

III. A 225 = K 192, L 168, R 211, T 158. I began to give over my *Enterprize*²⁶ and having ha | led²⁷ . . . I | stept²⁸ out, and sat²⁹ me down . . . I could perceive that the Tide was turn'd³⁰ and the Flood come³¹ on.

¹ reprieve, ladder, thieves, etc. RT. — ² just going BKR. — ³ murder BLRT. — ⁴ such-like T. — ⁵ Surprize BK. — ⁶ freshening LRT. — ⁷ cheerfully LRT. — ⁸ Foot BKLRT. — ⁹ carry'd BK, carried LRT. — ¹⁰ astonished, buried, etc. RT. — ¹¹ entertained BK. — ¹² Notion KR. — ¹³ myself LRT. — ¹⁴ all BT. — ¹⁵ Apprehensi- | ons B. — ¹⁶ buried BKL. — ¹⁷ of | in B. — ¹⁸ the | Degenaracy B. — ¹⁹ Human BL, human RT. — ²⁰ I | had B. — ²¹ turned BKLRT. — ²² I | was B. — ²³ could BKLRT. — ²⁴ got RT. — ²⁵ walked LRT. — ²⁶ Enterprise LRT. — ²⁷ hauled LRT. — ²⁸ stepped LRT. — ²⁹ sate BKR. — ³⁰ turned LRT. — ³¹ came B.

Introduction.

The language of the 18th century has in its phonetical aspect been subjected to very careful examination; in other respects, however, (accidence, syntax, vocabulary, etc.) it has been comparatively little investigated. — A great deal of valuable material can be gleaned by consulting NED and the linguistic works of Bradley, Franz, Hall, Krieger, Stoffel, Sweet, and others; but there exists not a single monograph of any value on the subject, except the section of STORM's *Englische Philologie* entitled 'Die Sprache des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts' (pp. 918—950), which, however, is far from being exhaustive. — On pp. 944—45 Storm mentions and criticizes in a few lines a couple of works dealing with 18th century English: FRANZ: *Zur Syntax des älteren Neu-englisch* (ESt. 17, 18), and KLAPPERICH: *Zur Sprache des Lustspieldichters Sheridan*, Program, Elberfeld 1892. As these works have already been reviewed in our leading English periodicals, I shall refrain from adverting to them here.

Earlier works
on 18th cent.
English.

A little paper by C. STOFFEL entitled *Antiquated and Obsolescent Phrases in the Vicar of Wakefield* occurring in *Taalstudie*, which, as the author acknowledges, is 'largely drawn upon the admirable work of Prof. Storm', contains, as far as I can see, nothing new towards the study of 18th century English, beyond what has already been given by Storm. This paper was not reviewed by Storm, who was unable to procure a copy of it.

Another, more ambitious work on 18th century English: *Studies on the language of Samuel Richardson* by W. UHRSTRÖM (180 pp.) was published in 1907. — In the introduc-

tion which consists to a great extent of quotations and biographical items of doubtful value for the treatise, the author states that the object of his work is 'to show the most important points on which the language of Richardson's time differs from modern English, as it is spoken by educated people of our days', and he 'ventures to hope he has succeeded in bringing out some of the most characteristic features of the language of Richardson's time as compared with that of our own.' — For sundry reasons I do not feel inclined to subject this work to a detailed criticism, even though the points on which I have to find fault with are neither few nor trivial; but a few general remarks may not be out of place.

As the texts which Mr. U. used were published 20, 40, and even 60 years after the original editions, we have no security whatever that the readings given in them are really faithful to those editions; cf. pp. XXV, XXXVI. — In the bibliography p. 5, which, as it is, is scanty enough, we find a comparatively large number of works of very dubious value for the purpose of the treatise, while, on the other hand, we look in vain for many of the names and works of the leading scholars of our day. — Furthermore Richardson's language in the works Mr. U. used can in no way be said to be representative of the 'language of Richardson's time', as most people would understand the phrase. The author says on the very same page (3): 'to study the *spoken*¹ language of his time we can hardly find a better source than his works' (cf. Hall p. 320), and he further accentuates this assertion by saying that Richardson's 'mode of writing' enables him 'to make use of certain liberties of style which otherwise would hardly be tolerated by the reader.' — The author has moreover failed to support his assertion that Richardson's language is exactly the same as that of his contemporaries with any material gathered from the authors of Richardson's time.

And as to the author's 'comparison' between 'the language of Richardson's time' and PE, what does it after all

¹ The italics are mine.

amount to? It consists simply and solely in stating that a particular form, etc. found in Richardson — as to which he has no more illuminative information to give us than that it is 'often', 'sometimes', 'frequently used', 'met with' — does not occur in PE 'as it is spoken by educated people of our days'. This he has tried to show by quoting or referring to NED and Storm, or else by giving illustrative examples from PE novelists. On the other hand he fails to notice obvious instances of alternate forms, etc., such as pret. *drunk, drank* (pp. 22—29); *is come, has come* (p. 19), etc.

In such works as those of Klapperich (24 pp.) and Stoffel (8. pp.), which were written especially for pedagogical purposes, merely to draw the attention of their readers to certain differences between the language of Sheridan and Goldsmith and PE idiom, comments of this kind are well enough. But surely something more is looked for in a treatise which claims 'to have made some contributions to the study of the language of the eighteenth century'.¹

*

When I first began this work, of which I regret that at ^{My plan of work.} present I can only publish the first part, it was my intention merely to endeavour to call attention to the points in which the language of RC deviates from present day standard English. But a study of such works as that of Mr. Uhrström on the one hand, and the views put forward, and the principles enunciated in the works of Elster and Östergren, on the other hand, brought home to me more and more the unsatisfactoriness of this method of work. I saw that for a work of this description it was also a matter of great importance to endeavour to ascertain the relation in which the language of RC may be said to stand to that of other works both of Defoe and his contemporaries. And in this view I have been confirmed by the advice and information obligingly given me by eminent English scholars. With this object in

¹ Since the above remarks were printed Dr. SWAEN has published a somewhat nugatory review of Mr. U:s work in ESt.

view I have examined, though not so minutely as RC, some works from the beginning of the century, viz., RC II, CS, MF, PY, CG, REd.; TT, Sw. Let., Ta., Sp., PC, etc. and I have in commenting on RC given references, as a rule in footnotes, to the works just mentioned.

As regards the linguistic phenomena dealt with I have endeavoured, with regard to RC at least, to give as complete and exact information as possible. In cases where a complete list of examples of a certain linguistic phenomenon would have unreasonably swelled the bulk of the book, or where the examples are unimpeachable instances of the phenomenon in question I have, however, as a rule contented myself with giving only two or three examples, but then I have invariably added figures indicating the total number of times examples of this kind occur. In all other cases an exhaustive list of examples has been given. In cases where the language shows great oscillation between alternate forms and expressions, I have given the relative frequency of the alternate forms. In some cases I have given statistical data from other works as well, but as a rule I have contented myself with noting the occurrence of cases similar to those in RC, illustrating them with a few selected examples. In one or two instances I have ventured to mention in footnotes points which are quite common in works contemporary with RC, though it may chance that no example of them occurs in RC. -- In cases where an author appears to be deliberately using archaic language, or reflecting the colloquial or vulgar speech of his day, I have as a rule called attention to the fact.

To shed light on the subject from another point of view, that is to endeavour to show not only what was current, but also what was regarded as standard English by the learned of the time, I have given the views, statements, etc. found in the works of grammarians and lexicographers of the beginning of the 18th and the latter part of the 17th century, particularly Wallis. I have, however, not merely quoted their statements with regard to the forms etc. actually occurring in the works examined by me, but often also as to phenomena of a similar character.

The general condition of the language of the latter part of the century, and especially the by no means inconsiderable modifications which the language underwent as far back as the 18th century, I have endeavoured to illustrate by giving statements and views brought forward by Dr. Johnson and Ward, as well as by giving a number of examples of the language of *Evelina*, which evidently shows that much of what at the beginning of the century may have been regarded as perfectly correct, must by this time have already sunk down to the lower strata of the language: the colloquial and vulgar style. In many respects these facts have been further backed up by quotations, etc. from Pegge.

In certain cases it may perhaps be remarked that these grammatical notes are unnecessarily minute, or have sometimes not given results corresponding in value to the space they take up. An independent and, if possible, more detailed and exact examination of the existing grammars might be thought to have been preferable. But I regard them at any rate as quite as much in place in a work of this description as in a work dealing with the history of English sounds. Nor ought the novelty of my methods to diminish the value of these notes, as such, or of the value of the treatise in general: with a few exceptions these grammatical items are now brought before the reader for the first time and have not, as far as I know, been previously given in any other PE linguistic work.

As far as comparison with PE usage is concerned, I have thought it fit to assign to it a subordinate place. — Crediting my readers with a knowledge of PE usage I have often contented myself with merely giving references to linguistic works written during the last few decades by eminent scholars in this department.

General remarks on the language of RC.¹

Long sentences. During his long career as a journalist and pamphleteer Defoe had acquired the remarkably fluent and easy style, characteristic of RC. which both explains, and was the natural result of his unusual literary productiveness. As it was very often important for him to produce as much copy as possible in a very limited time, he had simply no leisure to pay attention to the graces of composition: he had no time to give conciseness to his diction, or to consider the proportions between the lengths of his sentences. His great verbosity, together with his predilection for long sentences — which often occupied from 10 to 15 lines — is one of the most obvious features of Defoe's style. These characteristics are so salient (examples of them abound on almost every page) that it seems to me unnecessary to illustrate them by quotations. — Let us take and examine a few pages of the MS of CG, and we get a good idea of Defoe's method of composition in general, and specially his mode of building up sentences. It was his practice often to insert into his main sentences, already of a goodly length, clauses, long or short, subordinate or disconnected, qualifying or amplifying the former.

¹ Many of the features of the language of RC which will be pointed out here have previously been brought forward in most of the numerous *Biographical Sketches* and *Lives* of Defoe as characteristic of Defoe's style in general, though, to be sure, as we might expect from the character of those works, not with any degree of completeness. As, moreover, the results at which I have arrived in my comparative researches are in complete accordance with the statements made in the works just alluded to, I have not deemed it necessary to give any examples to show that Defoe's style in these points agrees with that of his other works. — Those who might wish for further particulars on the style of Defoe in general, I refer to the works published from CHALMERS and WILSON up to TH. WRIGHT, and AITKEN (in R) and especially to BULBRING, to whose editions of CG and REd. with their valuable 'Forewords' I feel greatly indebted.

Much the same impression of something added on second thoughts is produced by the frequent use of tacking on relative sentences introduced by *and who*, *and which*, as . . . 'my Mother, whose Relations were named Robinson, a very good Family in that Country, *and from whom* I was called Robinson Kreutznaer' 1.15 — 'he had appointed to go out with two Moors of some Distinction in that Place, *and for whom* he had provided extraordinarily' 22.27 — 'Tho' I did not carry quite 100 l. of my new gain'd Wealth, so that I had 200 left, *and which* I lodg'd with my Friend's Widow, yet' . . . 19.14. — 'Another lay bound which they would kill next *and which* fir'd all the very soul within me' 276.18 — 'He gets his Boots off, and put on a Pair of Pumps (as we call the flat Shoes they wear) *and which* he had in his Pocket' 349.24, etc. etc.

In many cases, when the accumulation of sentences and their somewhat intricate arrangement threaten to destroy the continuity of the narrative for the reader, Defoe tries to bridge over the difficulty by inserting some such expressions as *I say*, *in a Word*, etc., repeating the beginning of the long period, either with the same or a slightly varying phrase, such as 'I went . . . I found . . . and as the few Books . . . lay there too, I took out one of the Bibles . . . *I say*, I took it out and' . . . 109.19-27; 326.15-21 — 'Two of the Ships which I had singl'd out to go in, I mean, more particularly singl'd out than any other, that is to say, so as in one of them to put my things on Board, and in the other to have agreed with the Captain; *I say* two of these Ships miscarry'd, viz. One was taken' . . . 342.24-36 — 'To Day we love what to Morrow we hate . . . nay even tremble at the Apprehensions . . . this was exemplify'd in me (184.29) . . . *I say* that I should now tremble at the very Apprehensions' . . . 185.9 — 'a raging Wave, Mountain-like came rowling . . . and plainly bad us expect the Coup de Grace. *In a word*, it took us with such a Fury, that' . . . 50.26 — 'I brought away . . . Rigging . . . Ropes and Rope-twine . . . Canvass . . . *In a Word*, I brought away all the Sails' . . . 64.12-21; 64.22-34.

The joining together of sentences with *as* — *so* is another frequently occurring method of connecting the clauses of the long periods. This *so* introducing a consequent clause, which may be compared with the German and Swedish *so*, *så* in similar use, is now almost obsolete in PE. For instance, . . . 'and tho' the Storm began to abate a little, yet *as* it was not possible she could swim till . . . *so* the Master continued firing Guns 13.11 — I saw the Ship had floated and was driven on Shore again . . . which *as* it was some Comfort on one hand, for seeing her sit upright and not broken to Pieces, I hop'd, if I might get on board, and get . . . *so* on the other hand, it renew'd my Grief at the Loss of my Comrades, who I imagin'd if we had all staid on board might have sav'd the Ship, or at least that they would not have been all drown'd . . . and that' . . . 81.22-82.1 — 'As the Bear is . . . and does not gallop as the Wolf does, who is swift . . . *so* he has two particular Qualities, First, As to Men, who are not his proper Prey; *I say*, not his proper Prey; because tho' I cannot say what Hunger might do, which was now their Case, the Ground being all cover'd with Snow; but as to Men, he does not attempt them unless they first attack him' 348.16-25 — Further ex: 98.1-5; 180.18-30; 185.16-28; 291.25, etc.

But in these extremely long periods, jotted down in the greatest haste, we must not be surprised that sometimes the strict grammatical sequence between the different clauses of the period is broken. The author often begins with a certain grammatical construction, but further on in the sentence he either forgets the beginning of the statement, or by some confusion of thought caused by the complex arrangement of the clauses, he finds himself unable to finish the sentence as he first intended, and so flounders into another construction. Notwithstanding these loose constructions, *anacolutha*, the clearness and point of the periods is never lost, so far as I can see. I have already had occasion to mention a couple of periods in which similar grammatical breaks occur. Here are some additional examples: 'The Master, tho' vigilant . . . ,

yet as he went in and out... I could hear him say'... 10.32-37 = 239.1 — 'perhaps this is all befallen us on your Account, like Jonah in the Ship of Tarshish' 15.30 —... 'I consulted neither Father or Mother nor so much as sent them Word of it; but leaving them to hear of it as they might, without asking God's Blessing... and in an ill Hour... I went on Board a Ship' 7.5-11 — 'I took up the second Piece... and shot him into the Head, and had the Pleasure to see him drop, and make but little Noise, but lay struggling for Life' 31.14-19 —... 'for unless I was sure to kill every one that not only should be on Shore... but that should ever come on Shore afterwards, if but one of them escap'd, to tell... they would come again' 204.1-11. —

* * *

Without the author himself being conscious of the fact, Characteristic phrases. his lively imagination, and the fluency of his language often seem to have carried him away from his proper subject. Thus when he wishes to return to his original train of thought after such a long digression, he very often does so by means of some connecting phrase, as: 'But this is by the Way' 286.17 — 'But to return to my Journal' 92.32; 106.35 — 'But leaving this Part, I return to my Journal' 113.36, etc. In other cases also, as for example when he passes from one section of his continuous narrative to another, for the sake of lucidity, he marks the transition by connecting phrases such as 'But I must first give some little Account of my self' 72.6 — 'Be pleas'd to take a Scetch of my Figure as follows' 176.19 — 'But some Adventures that happen'd to us in this tedious and difficult Journey, I must not omit' 344.1 = 186.4 — 'But now I come to a new Scene of my Life' 181.28, etc.

In order to excite his readers' interest beforehand he has a way of mentioning in a few words a subject which he afterwards intended to treat more fully, e. g. 'what I did... I shall give a full Account of in its Place' 72.5 — 'a Dog and two Cats, of whose eminent History I may have occasion to

say something in its Place' 75.3; 208.9 — ... 'as I shall say afterwards in its Order' 92.20 — 'as I shall observe in its Order' 124.18 — 'as shall be observ'd' 139.31; 218.25; 330.36, etc. etc. On the other hand, to remind his readers of something which has gone before, and which he wishes to impress on them again, he often uses one of his favourite expressions, such as 'But as I said' 357.31 — 'as I have said' 201.35 — 'As I said above' 300.35 — 'as is said above' 178.7 — 'as before' 300.25, etc. etc.

And finally in order to summarize or explain, sometimes in order to qualify or apologize for a previous statement Defoe frequently makes use of phrases such as 'in short' 45.35 — 'vis' 72.14; 137.29 — 'that is to say' 179.35; 253.11 — 'as it were' 234.32; 237.35 — 'as I may call it' 230.20; 232.6 — 'as I may say' 53.1 — 'as it might be said' 137.24, etc. etc.

But the most common of these parenthetical expressions of his are the following, which, together with his very frequent use of the *historical present*, contribute perhaps more than anything to lend life and colour to his language, e. g. 'I go! says *I* (next line) No, No, says *he*' 266.33 — 'he comes and gives ... says *I* ... says *he*' 268.27; 'Friday looks ... falls a jumping and calls out ... says *he*' 265.7 — 'well Xury, said *I*' 27.2; 'besides, said *he*' 37.18 etc. etc.; cf. p. 60.

The frequent use of the nominative form *who* for the objective *whom*, e. g. 'a Goat *who* I found' 212.30; '*who* he told me of' 276.20; '*who* must we yield to' 317.16, etc.; Defoe's predilection for using the *personal gender* (cf. p. 39) and the relative pronoun *who* in regard to animals and things, and the exceedingly frequent use of the *perfect infinitive* instead of the present infinitive, e. g. I carry'd the Kid over my Pale, in hopes to have bred it up tame 71.32, etc. are further characteristic features of the language of RC which will be treated at length in the second part of my treatise.

All these peculiarities noticed above, the overlong sentences, these loose constructions often pointing to sudden breaks in the train of thought, these long digressions, infinite repetitions, and exaggerated exactness of expression, the use of such set phrases as 'I say', 'as above', 'says I' etc. which give, as it were, a more personal and original touch to Defoe's style, often constituting a safe means of identifying his works, are rather characteristic of the easy, colloquial speech than of the more refined, conventional, literary language, where the original thought is worked out and developed in a more grammatical and logical form. — Defoe did not trouble himself to try to clothe his thoughts in the dress generally given to them in more serious, 'literary' language. He never aimed, I think, at being a stylist in the modern sense of the word, i. e. a literary artist who for merely aesthetic purposes takes pains to turn out sentences of fine rhythm and choice phrasing; any elegancies of style would have been wholly wasted upon the audience which he addressed. He was always eminently practical, and didactic, a man of affairs and of business (cf. Wright: *Life of D.* p. 284 ff.). His great object was to speak clearly and forcibly, his one thought to give a sense of reality to his readers, to make his words do their work, and strike home.

Defoe reached this goal more nearly than probably any other English author, by his simple, matter-of-fact, homely language, very often corresponding to the free and easy, every-day speech. He wrote his story in the simplest possible way, hardly ever using a word that could puzzle even the meanest artisan; both learned and unlearned could understand, and find pleasure in it. This is no doubt one of the chief reasons for the never failing popularity of *Robinson Crusoe*.

Defoe's own works give us very valuable information on this subject. Thus in the first number of the *Universal Spectator* (1728), containing a prospectus and an introductory essay on the qualifications of a good writer, he states his principles of composition as to 'what is required to denominate a good writer'. — 'The writer that strives to be useful', he

states, 'writes to *serve* you, and at the same time, by an imperceptible art, draws you on to be *pleased*, also'. — And in CG (p. 219) he develops more fully his opinions of the characteristics of a good style. Thus he writes: 'He taught his pupils to write a masculine and manly stile, to write the most polite English . . . to kno' how to suit their manner as well to the subject they were to write upon as to the persons or degrees of persons they were to write to; and all equally free and plain, without foolish flourishes and ridiculous flights of jingling bombast in stile, or dull meanesses of expression below the dignity of the subject or the character of the writer.'

And I think it may be said that, on the whole, Defoe carried out quite satisfactorily in practice his theories on the style of a good author set forth in the above passages.

* * *

Foreign Elements.

Defoe had this much in common with his contemporary essayists that he addressed himself to a very heterogeneous circle of readers and wrote, like them, in an easy, simple and perspicuous style, which seems more or less closely to reflect the colloquial idiom of the day. However on closer examination we shall find that at least in one respect, viz. the use of *words of foreign extraction*, there is a marked divergence between his own language and theirs.

If, for instance, we compare a few numbers of Sp. and Ta. with similar PE works we shall find — esp. in the papers which were written by Addison — a much larger percentage of words of Romanic origin than are in common use at the present day, but not so many as we meet with in Dr. Johnson and other writers of the middle and later parts of the 18th century where the culmination with regard to the use of learned words in ordinary literary style was reached (cf. Jesp. Str. p. 146). — On the other hand in RC and Defoe's works as a whole, even in those of a more discursive and learned character, e. g. CG, the percentage of Romanic words is small in comparison with PE works.

That this is actually the case will soon be evident to anyone who takes the trouble to read attentively some score of pages in any of Defoe's works. However, in order more thoroughly to confirm my views on this point, and in order to determine the proportion between words of Germanic and foreign (esp. Romanic) origin I have counted the words which occur in the first five pages of RC and CG and on pp. 200—204 of PY. The result is as follows. Of 1397 words (each word being counted every time it occurs) in RC 1144 are of Germanic, 253 of Romanic origin; the few words of other or doubtful origin do not affect the result at all. The corresponding figures in CG are 1476, 1174, 302; in PY 1706, 1418, 288. Any comments on these figures are, I think, not called for.—As we see, RC has an extremely low percentage of words of Romanic origin. In this respect the purely democratic character of RC exhibits itself perhaps more than in any other way. In this connection it is well worth noting that RC and *Pilgrim's Progress*, the books which English people have read and no doubt always will read, more than any others next to the Bible, are with respect to the purity of language from loan words unrivalled in the whole reach of English literature (cf. Jesp. Str. p. 130).

Whereas the works of practically all contemporary authors are crowded with allusions, quotations and phrases from classical literature, every number of Sp. and Ta., for inst., being headed by a Latin or Greek quotation, we find nothing of the kind in RC.¹ Not only this. In CG (p. 222) Defoe gives vent to his distinct disapproval of 'the humour or usage of the day, that nothing but classic reading is call'd litera-

¹ In CG, the contents of which are of a more discursive and learned character, a good many Latin phrases and quotations (as a rule printed in italics, which is always the case in RC with the foreign words) are met with, e. g. *Ecce Platonis homo* 93; *idem est non esse et non apperire* 188; *Novum Castrum* 115; *in aeternum* 173, etc. In PY, however, there occurs, as far as I can see, not a single word borrowed either from Latin or any other foreign language. — Note that in PY the scene of Defoe's story is laid in London.

ture' and continues: 'It is the vanity of this particular kind that has brought it into a proverb to the scandal of our nation, that an Englishman has his mouth full of borrow'd phrases, that he is alwayes borrowing other men's languages and quoteing other men's sentences in Latin, but saies none of his own; not an author writes a pamphlet, not a poet a copy of verses, no, not to his mistress, tho' she knows nothing of the matter, but he draws a bill upon Horace or Virgil or some of the old chiming train, and talks as familiarly of them as if they had been brought up together'¹. And in a reply to Swift, who had spoken of him scornfully as 'an illiterate fellow, whose name I forget' he declares that 'he had been in his time pretty well master of five languages, and not lost them yet, though he wrote no bill at his door, nor set Latin quotations on the front of his Review.'²

In RC the Holy Scripture is the only book Defoe quotes or alludes to. But then these quotations, etc. are so much the more frequent. And in order to set them in relief, these quotations, possibly by Defoe's instructions, are generally printed in italics. — One or other example of archaisms, probably due to reminiscences from the Bible, are also met with in RC. For instance: I sat down to my *Meat* with Thankfulness 153.14; Lord be merciful to us, we shall all be lost, we shall all be *undone* 10.36; 129.12; You will meet with nothing but Disasters... till your Father's Words are *fullfilled upon* you 16.11; I did not take... by Crying to God... and *resting upon his Providence* 188.35. — Whether the *reflexive use of the personal pronoun* is also to be considered as due to the influence of the Bible (cf. Storm p. 1003) or as a colloquialism from Defoe's point of view, it is very difficult to deter-

¹ Swift too was no great admirer of Greek and Latin words, esp. in sermons, which in his view ought to be specially simple and easy of comprehension. In *Letters to a young clergyman*, etc. he protests against the clergy's use of obscure terms which the women call 'hard words' and others call 'fine language', and rejoices that he has lived to see Greek and Latin almost entirely driven out of the pulpit.

² W. MINTO, *Daniel Defoe* p. 4.

mine, e. g. I gat *me* up the Hill 195.18; I sat *me* down 52.30; I got *me* a Piece 107.13, etc.

*.

The divergences in the language of Defoe and his contemporaries that have been pointed out above are also without doubt to be ascribed to some extent to the difference in school teaching which fell to Defoe's lot, and to that of his contemporaries in general. Even in his school-days, at the Nonconformist academy at Newington Green, Defoe was already imbued with an ardent love of his mother-tongue. Here also the first foundation was laid of his lifelong¹ feud against 'these Greek and Latin mongers' (CG 201) who entirely neglected the study of their mother-tongue, and 'lock'd up all science in Greek and Latin.'² This 'deficiency of education' was by no means confined to the universities;³ 'that custome has so prevail'd at our universities that all the publick exercises in the schooles are perform'd in the learned language'. — 'To rectifye this great mistake of the schools' Defoe proposes to set up an academy wherein to teach 'all the parts of academick learning and all this in English.' 'It would be a happy encouraging step', he says, 'if the learned labours of the masters of the age were made to speak English, to be levell'd to the capascities of the more unlearned part of man-kind'.

The man who was first and foremost Defoe's model, and in many respects influenced his reformatory endeavours, was without doubt the 'polite and profound scholar' the Rev.

¹ Already in his *Essay on Projects* (1698) he suggests the foundation of an academy 'in Conformity to what was the Case in France to refine and correct the Language... a Subject not at all less worthy the Labours of such a Society than the French'.

² In CG Defoe has devoted the whole chapter pp. 184—231 to combating the absurd school methods prevalent in his day.

³ 'Gentlemen from the University', he says, 'can hardly spell their mother-tongue... have no stile, no diction, no beauty or cadence of expression... twould be a shame to hear one of them declaim in English'... (CG p. 198).

Charles Morton, to whom Defoe always referred with gratitude (see CG p. 218). By his method of teaching very much contrary to the custom of the times (he both drilled his pupils in good English, and read his lectures in English) 'the pupils', says Defoe, 'were made masters of the English tongue, and more of them excelled in that particular than any school at that time'.

Borrowed words.¹

As I have mentioned before, we find in RC neither allusions to nor quotations from classical literature. In some few cases, however, I have found him use isolated Latin words, which, on account of the context, were doubtless intelligible to the great majority of Defoe's readers.

Latin

The following are the instances found: If I kill'd one Party, suppose Ten, or a Dozen, I was to kill another and so another, even *ad infinitum*, 218.4; I have been . . . a *Memento* to those who are touched with the general Plague of Mankind 230.12; a daily *Memorandum* 122.15; I was oblig'd to let it (the Canoe) lye there as a *Memorandum* to teach me to be wiser next Time 161.5; the Size of it (the Periagua) was not answerable to . . . venturing over to the *Terra Firma* 161.17.

French.

As a result of the constant wars with France, English was by this time flooded by a large number of French words and phrases, and the colloquial speech, letters and periodical publications and pamphlets of the day especially, abounded with them. This influx of French words seems to have influenced Defoe just as little as the other great authors of that time.² Only in one single case have I come across a French

¹ The so-called 'citatord', see ÖSTERGREN, p. 7.

² Ta. and Sp. contain several sharp aspersions on 'the French humours' and 'the Vanity of the time'. I may give, by way of example, the following quotation from Sp. 165, containing, besides specimens of 'hard Words and dark Expressions', a letter, 'very modishly chequered with this Modern Military Eloquence': — 'I have often wished, that as in our Constitution there are several Persons whose Business it is to watch over our Laws . . . certain Men might be set apart, as Super-intendants of our Language, to hinder

phrase of this kind: the Wave bad us expect the *Coup de Grace* 50.27.

A similar use of a Dutch expression occurs only in the Dutch following sentence: the sea went dreadful high . . . and might well be call'd *Den wild Zee*, as the Dutch Call the Sea in a Storm 49.36.

The few Spanish and Italian words which occur are, I ^{Spanish and Italian.} think, only to be regarded as one of Defoe's many attempts to give an air of verisimilitude and local colour to the style, e. g. *Seignior Inglese*, says he 40.33; . . . and he said, *Espagnole* . . . *Seignor*, said I, with as much Spanish as I could make up 279.5, 9; I made my Escape in the *Barco-Longo*, from among the Moors of Sallee 330.17; the *Ingenio*, so they call'd the Sugar-House 334.7, 19 etc.; I wrote . . . desiring the good *Padres* Prayers for me 341.28; my whole Army . . . viz. my self *Generalissimo* 316.33.

We must, no doubt, regard from the same point of view ^{Negro} English. the language which Defoe puts in the mouth of his man Friday and the young Moor Xury 'who spoke such English by conversing with us Slaves' (RC p. 27). Here I shall only give a few examples of Defoe's attempts at representing Negro English: Two Canoe 255.34; Wild Mans 28.22; 254.7; me shakee te Hand 349.8; me speakee wit you 349.33; ugly Dog eat all up self 283.10; He eat me at one Mouth 30.35; much enough Vittle 267.35, etc., etc. — The main interest of this language lies, no doubt, in the fact that it is one of the earliest, if not the earliest, attempts to represent in fiction the speech of the savage.

* * *

any Words of Foreign Coin from passing among us; and in particular to prohibit any *French* Phrases from becoming Current in this Kingdom, when those of our own Stamp are altogether as valuable. The present War has so adulterated our Tongue with strange Words, that it would be impossible for one of our Great Grandfathers to know what his Post-
erity have been doing, were he to read their Exploits in a Modern News-
Paper.'

Archaism of language.

Storm is probably the first to draw attention to the mistake that the language of the classical authors of the 18th century was regarded as an unrivalled model of correct English, even from a PE point of view.¹ 'Die klassischen Werke aus dem 18. Jh.', he says (p. 652), 'sind alle sprachlich mehr oder weniger veraltet; es würde lächerlich sein, sich wie Defoe, Swift, Johnson, Goldsmith auszudrücken. Die klassische Sprachform ist nicht mehr dieselbe. Gerade der *Robinson* wimmelt von Archaismen.' — As we see, Storm in this respect singles out especially the language of RC, and he is by no means alone in this view. It is a very widely diffused notion, the truth of which, as far as I know, has never been questioned, that the language of RC is more archaic than that of his contemporary authors, or even that of Defoe's other works, but I have been unable to discover who is the prime originator of this idea. In the great biographers of Defoe from Chalmers and Wilson down to Wright and Aitken, who I suppose must be regarded as well acquainted with the English of the beginning of the 18th century, there is, as far as I can see, nothing which can serve in the least to bear out an idea of this kind. In Shaw,² however, we find the following passage p. 335: 'Defoe's object was not to instruct(!) but to amuse, to captivate, that mysterious faculty by which we identify ourselves with imaginary events, and this the most successfully he did by imitating not only the plain, straight forward unaffected narratives of the old navigators, but their simple idiomatic unadorned diction.'

This view which has no authority whatever to support it must, when weighed against the views of later historians of literature, be regarded as a mere fancy. — That the modern annotated school-editions of RC should reproduce this unfounded statement of Shaw's, merely remodelling it and

¹ Cf. STOFFEL VW and Est. 17.280.

² THOMAS SHAW, *A History of English Literature*, 16th ed. 1887, ed. by W. SMITH. — The passage quoted is no doubt to be found in earlier editions also.

commenting upon it each after their own fashion, ought not to occasion very much surprise. But it is rather astonishing that Storm (p. 932) on the basis of this apparently loose statement can found his assertion that: '*Defoe* scheint in seinem *Robinson* geflissentlich die altertümliche Sprache der alten Entdecker nachgeahmt zu haben; er steht hier auf dem Übergang vom 17. zum 18. Jh.; in seinen übrigen Schriften ist sein Styl moderner'.

As we have seen both Shaw and Storm declare that Defoe imitated the language of the old navigators, but they are both equally careful not to give us any inkling which of the 'old navigators' are intended. For my own part I have not succeeded in discovering these models of his, nor have I been able to find anything which could give even a shadow of support to Storm's talk about deliberate imitation (Cf. the opinions of Aitken and Dobson quoted below). The untenableness of the statement thrown out by Shaw seems also to have been realized by Hamilton Thompson, who, in the 1901 edition of Shaw's works prepared by him, has found it advisable to omit the above quoted passage.

That Defoe during his eventful life both at home and abroad hobnobbed with a great number of 'travellers, voagers, surveyors, soldiers', etc. (CG p. 226) and that he was well read in the narratives of the contemporary navigators and travellers, etc. is a well known and recognized fact. That, on the other hand, he read the adventures of some of the 'old navigators' — by this phrase we should understand first and foremost the old navigators of the 16th and early 17th century — I consider very improbable and at any rate in no way proved. The contemporary literature was too well supplied with descriptions of voyages and romances of adventure both by land and sea. There he found without doubt sufficient food both for his desire for knowledge and his imagination.¹

¹ In CG p. 225 ff. Defoe tells us the delight that the reading of similar books and essays gave him; besides — and this is for us the most important point — he gives us an exact description of how he read them and gathered his material, namely with a map or a chart before him. — 'If

and did not require to grope about in musty old books to seek for models in any respect. He was too practical, and his time was too much occupied for him to concern himself with such trifles as imitating the style of works he had read.

Further, as regards Storm's second statement 'in seinen übrigen Schriften ist sein Styl moderner' I cannot see that a greater value ought to be attached to it than to his opinion as to Defoe's relation to the old navigators. Although I have not considered it necessary to give as numerous illustrations out of, e. g. PY (MF, CS) and CG as from RC, nevertheless the examples I have selected from very rich collections are, I think, sufficient to disprove a statement of this kind.

On the other hand, as regards the language of the contemporary authors, and especially in the works out of which illustrative examples have been quoted here, my studies on the subject have not, I consider, been sufficiently deep to warrant my expressing any conclusive judgment for the present. In one respect, however, namely with regard to accident in a strict sense, the researches which have been made in this department may have tended to show that the language of RC cannot be said to possess any more archaic character than that of contemporary works of fiction. In certain cases these works actually show even greater divergences from PE than RC.

* * *

By way of concluding this section and the whole of my introduction I consider it desirable to quote with due

he has not travell'd in his youth... he may make the tour of the world in books. He may travell by land with the historian, by sea with the navigators. He may go round the globe with Dampier and Rogers, and kno' a thousand times more by doing it than all those illiterate sailors... those kno' but every man his share, and that shar but little... But he receives the idea of the whole at one view. The studious geographer and the well read historian travells with not this or that navigator or traveller... but he keeps them all company...

reservation some opinions which Mr. Aitken and Mr. Dobson, probably two of the leading authorities of the present day on Defoe and Defoe's language, have been obliging enough to send to me privately. — Mr. Aitken writes: 'I do not think that there is any foundation for the statement in Shaw's book which you quote. The 'old navigators' were not remarkable for idiomatic diction, and Defoe wrote simply in his own natural style, as you will see by comparing 'Robinson Crusoe' with such books as 'Religious Courtship' or 'Moll Flanders.' — 'Robinson Crusoe' is not, in my opinion, more archaic in language than Defoe's other works, or than the writings of Defoe's contemporaries. Defoe did not write in a dialect, but he used in his works the current speech of the people more unhesitatingly than Addison or Swift. He was fond of colloquial expressions («'tis» for «it is», etc.) and he used fewer words of classical origin. Naturally the language in political treatises is stiffer and more 'literary' than that in a story written in the first person, and intended for a wide audience. The colloquial expressions of the day are to be found in plays and in such a book as Swift's 'Journal to Stella' — letters not written for publication — or in Swift's 'Genteel Conversation' which is in the form of dialogue. Simple diction was of course eminently fitting in a book which purports to be by an unlearned man like Crusoe.'

Mr. Dobson says: 'In reply to your guesses . . . I do not think that Defoe troubled himself about imitating the written style of the old navigators. He wrote in his own plain English — nothing more. — Of course, Defoe, as a realist, used seafaring terms and endeavoured to get the *tone* of the old navigators; but I do not think he went out of his way to mimic their phraseology'.

Orthography.

As late as in the early part of the 18th century there still prevailed very great negligence and confusion in spelling matters, which in those days, in contrast to our times, were often looked upon as trifles not worth considering. This state of things is always reflected and often deeply lamented in the dictionaries, the grammars, and numerous spelling-books, etc. of the time published to regulate and settle the spelling. Even the great essayists Addison and Swift express, e. g. in Sp. 105, 135, etc., Ta. 230, Sw. Prop. p. 16, and PC p. 360 their indignation at the wretched, inconsistent orthography of their day, and especially at the phonetic spelling then in vogue 'among our English Writers whose usual Pretence is, That they spell as they speak (Ta. 230; cf. p. 27). But the one who most sharply criticizes the wretched spelling is Defoe, who, esp. in CG (e. g. p. 120 and XXIII) incessantly points out and scoffs at the ignorance in this respect then existing, esp. among the nobility and gentry.

In view of this one cannot, on comparing Defoe's MSS on the one hand, with Steele's and Swift's on the other, but be very much surprised at finding that especially Defoe in his MSS by his negligent and faulty spelling lays himself open to criticism, perhaps even to a greater extent than any of his contemporaries; cf. p. XIX and 84. To include here the rather ample material upon which the above statement is based might possibly be of a certain amount of interest; but I consider this hardly suitable.

On page XIX I called, on the one hand, attention to a few instances in which the spelling in CG and RC differ; on the

other hand I pointed out that the orthography in RC does not on the whole seem to differ from the accepted style of the time, such as it appears from the printed works of the period. Neither did I consider it necessary to prove this assertion of mine in the latter case. The examples quoted from the works examined by me, the spelling of which has always been retained, might in this case be quite sufficient to prove the real circumstances. Any more detailed statement concerning orthography in general must, in my opinion, be considered of rather doubtful value for a treatise of this nature. The above general remarks may therefore be taken as quite sufficient. — Those who desire to have a more detailed statement concerning the conditions of spelling in Defoe's time I refer specially to the works of Ellis, Sweet, Bülbring (CG), Ekwall, and Horn, in which most of the points here in question are touched upon. And finally to a work by F. Schnaar: *Die Englische Orthographic seit Shakespeare* (1907), which, in spite of its many inaccuracies, gives us a very good idea of the confusion in the spelling of the time. — In the second half of the century, however, matters assume quite a different aspect: Dr. Johnson tells us in his dictionary that he has been adjusting 'the orthography which has been to this time unsettled and fortuitous', and the fact is that JDict. brought about uniformity out of the previous confusion in spelling and gave the stamp of authority to the prevalent habits of the London printers, and only now can one truly say that a standard orthography has been arrived at.

Some Phonological Notes.

In this connection I will only point out a few cases of syncope and aphaeresis which seem to have been of very frequent occurrence in the early part of the 18th century. — In the first place this applies to the very numerous cases of syncope before the consonants *l*, *n*, *r* (esp. in verbs ending in *-el*, *-en*, *-er*) occurring side by side with the unsyncopated ones to much the same extent in all the printed works of the time. In poetry the syncopated forms seem to be even at the very least just as common as the full ones.

In Defoe's MSS such forms (esp. regarding substantives and adjectives) are even more frequently met with than in his printed works, which may no doubt be laid to the printer's charge. This supposition is, I think, also confirmed by the fact that B has very often changed the syncopated forms in A in agreement with PE use:

fastned (4)¹ 347.1; freshning 166.7; hardned (2) 103.15; heartned 273.17; heartning 187.11; shortned 36.27; straitned 120.37; thickned 190.17, 21; — oftner (3) 21.21. — *fastned* 228.9; ² *hardned* 9.34; *listned* 256.37; *wakned* 304.21.

entred (11) 20.3; entring (3) 18.10; imcumbred 346.19; numbred 254.27; remembred 90.4; remembring (4) 90.28; wandred 206.8; wandring (7) 43.13; wondring 307.8. — *entred* (2) 257.32; *registered* 334.3; *rendred* (2) 131.14; *wondred* 145.31. — *Intrest* 46.1; cf. Entrance > B Enterance 211.32; monstrous > B monstrous 177.31; 191.8; ventrous > B venturous 128.30.³

¹ The figures in brackets indicate the number of times a certain form quoted occurs.

² The forms in italics are in B the same as the PE forms.

³ PY abounds with similar ex.

The existence of such pronunciations with the *e* syncopated is confirmed by the statements of contemporary grammarians, e. g. Jones (see Ekwall p. CCLII) and Maittaire p. 25. — The author of *Observations* expresses his decided disapproval of these syncopated forms which are styled as a 'poets' abbreviating license inexcusable in Prose'.

* *

Words that occur fairly frequently in the sentence in a weak stressed position are often liable to a reduction and to be contracted with other words of stronger stress. The same as in PE, such contractions (esp. of pronouns and auxiliaries) were very common in Defoe's time to denote spoken language, e. g.:¹

CG brightn'd 161; enlightn'd 173; lessning 255; threatning (2) 249; weakning 185; — altred 85; considring 245; delivred 182; delivr'd (2) 53; delivring 199; discovred (2) 154; discovr'd 141; encumbr'd (2) 102; (unencumbr'd 104; incumbr'd 244; incumbring 243); entring (2) 171; mastr'd 229; offred (2) 78; ordr'd 270; quatring 63; recovred (2) 253; recovr'd 186; recoverng 193; remembr'd (4) 32; remembring 131; rendred (2) 185; rendr'd 152; squandring 254; suffr'd 224; wandred 69; wandring 189; wand'ring 20; — flattery 154; indiffrent 61; lib'rall 211; modrate 102; rendrings 223; cf. vigorous (2) 81.

REd. [no inst. of verbs given] aesp'rare 12; diffrent 38; intrest (5) 45; mystry 130; revrence 58; cf. favrites (2) 24.

TT shrivled 263; — blackning 153; christned 52; enlightned (2) 288; lengthning 54; moistned 304; shortned 233; streighthned 128; threatned 239; threatning 265; oftner 136; — administrd 4; encountred 55; engendring 247; entred (6) 48; entring (6) 154; hindred 175; hindring 97; ministring 254; remembred 71; thundring 106; wandred (2) 117; wandring 243; watring 44; wondred 102.

It is a particularly noteworthy fact that Swift in his own MSS (**Sw. Let.**) uses such contracted forms e. g: endeavrd 31; entring 51; hindred (2) 17; squandring 41; tattred 47.

Sp. listned 56.3; listning 454.6; softned 121.2; streighthned (3) 68.1; oftner 59.2; threatned 81.8; threatning (2) 249.2; — entred 37.4; entring (4) 335.2; remembring 343.9; wondring 343.9, etc.

¹ **CG** numerous inst. pp. 44, 124 ff., etc.

you're but a fresh Water Sailor . . . *we'll* forget all; *d're* see what charming Weather *'tis* now; a Cap full *d'you* call it; *'twas* a terrible Storm 9.5; *Let's* first make it; *I'll* warrant *I'll* find some way when *'tis* done 149.17; *who's* that 317.12: *there's* your Ship 323.24, etc. etc.

Note: All these passages are printed in italics to denote spoken language, as was the custom in those days.

But yet there is a very striking difference between PE and the English of the early 18th century; we find such contracted forms practically in all styles of writing: in essays, in the prose of the ordinary novel, and even in the stiff style of the grammars.¹ — Thus RC, the same as other contemporary works, teems with such forms as the following even in the ordinary narrative:

'tis certain 207.35; 275.11; *'twas* my Duty 185.33; 305.2: *'Twas* to me as . . . 228.31; *'twas* (B *it was*) Ten Thousand 183.15, etc. — *you don't* 348.26; *he won't* 348.30, etc.

Note: The form *it's*, commonly used in colloquial PE practically never occurs in the works from the first half of the 18th century. I came across this form only once, CG p. 139: *Look Ye, Sir, it's* no matter what . . .

Similar contractions which first in the 17th century and probably only in the last decades of it came into fairly current use in literature, had become, as hinted above, quite fashionable at the beginning of the 18th century; cf. Dietze p. 43 and NED. Only a couple of authors express a decided disapproval of them. In *Ta. 230, in 'a Copy of a Letter from a most accomplished Person'* SWIFT gives us a long list of 'the false Refinements of Twenty Years past', which he doubts any 'Man of Wit who died forty Years ago' would be able either to read or far less to understand. And in

¹ CG *'tis* 94; *'twas* 11, 130; *'Twould* 94, 123; *that's* past and *can't* be help'd 96. — MAITTAIRE (Preface): *'tis*, *'twill*, *can't*, *don't*. — JONES: *'tis* 18.19; *you'll* 10, 11, etc. — BRIGHTLAND always *'tis*.

Sw. Prop. he abuses the poets of the Restoration that spoiled the English tongue by introducing 'that barbarous custom of abbreviating words'. Besides that he is utterly offended with the 'foolish Opinion advanced of late Years that we ought to spell exactly as we speak' which among other things 'would utterly destroy our Etymology and entirely confound Orthography'.¹ — These opinions by 'one of the greatest Geniuses this Age has produced' (Sp. 135) are subsequently only repeated and further commented upon by ADDISON 'communicating to the Publick his Speculations upon the English Tongue' (Sp. 135); furthermore in the introduction of PC and also by the author of *Observations*. (Cf. pp. 22 and 93).²

¹ It is very remarkable that, notwithstanding the ridicule thrown by Swift on 'barbarous contractions', he constantly fell into that error in his private letters to Stella.

² In this connection I take the liberty of mentioning the form *an't*, *a'n't* for *am not*, *are not*. — For particulars see esp. NED and STORM p. 708 ff; 901.

PY I *an't* dead tho', says the Piper 107.

In **CG** both as used by a 'country gentleman': — 'sure I *an't* to be a trades-man; I am to be a gentleman; I *an't* to go to school' 89, and by 'a man of letters': '*An't* you rich' 129.

In **PC** a couple of inst. occur: I *an't* well 403; 408.

In **Ev.** only in vulgar or careless style: I *a'n't* sure II.20 (coachman); I *a'n't* much obliged to him II.42 (D). I *a'n't* half well III.176 (Ly. L); — *a'n't* you got out I.148; III.236 (c); they *a'n't* put down I.190 (c); sisters *a'n't* dressed II.78 (Br.); those *a'n't* half so near related I.142 (Miss P), etc.

Accidence.

I. The indefinite article.

Quite as in the 17th cent., there was still at the beginning of the 18th cent. great irregularity and uncertainty prevailing as to the use of the indefinite article *a, an* before a word beginning with *h*, or in certain cases, a vowel: *eu.u. o.*

BEN JONSON states (p. 74) that 'A gooth before Words beginning with consonants; and before all vowells, (diphthongs, whose first letter is Y. or W. excepted) it is turn'd into *an*: *an eville turne, a good turne.* So may it also before *h*: *an high heart.'*¹

By the beginning of the 18th cent., however, when the aspiration of *h* seems to have become more audible (see note 1 below), the grammarians are in general beginning to decree before what words beginning with *h a* or *an* respectively should be used. Thus JONES says (p. 20) that '*a* is written before Words that begin with a Consonant, *an . . .* before a Vowel or the Sound of a Vowel, as *an herb, an hour*, wherein the *h* is not sounded: But you must write *a* where 'tis sounded, as *a hat, a hen*'. Cf. Ekwall p. CCXXX ff.

Many of his words where *h* is apt to be mute (Jones p. 57) are enumerated in LEDIARD p. 131: 'In folgenden Wör-

¹ This is probably the passage S. JOHNSON has in his mind writing in his Dict: 'Grammarians of the last age direct, that *an* should be used before *h* (whence it appears that the English anciently aspirated less)'. Cf. also VODOZ p. 91.

tern ist das *H.* stumm und wird gar nicht gehört: *heir, honest, honour, hospital, hostler, hostile, hour, humble, humour, Humphrey.*¹ N. P., und in ihren Derivativen und Compositis. Jedoch in *Hereditary* wird das *h* von einigen prononcirt. *Herb:* (Kraut) wird von einigen *Erb.* von anderen aber *Hyerb* (in einem Klang) ausgesprochen.'

GREENWOOD (p. 78) seems, if he really means what he says, to hold the same opinion as to the use of *an*, before vowels, as will appear from many of my instances (*an* European, such *an* one, etc.) quoted below: 'when the Substantive begins with a vowel or *h*,² then we write *an* instead of *a*, if the *h* be sounded; as *an Eye, an Hour*; but *a Hare, a Hand, an Habit* or *a Habit*.'

I now pass to my examples. — Before words of *Germanic* origin *a* is the usual form: *a Hammer* 23.33; *a hand* 22.15; *a Hammock* (origin uncertain) 69.18, etc. — Before *half* and *hundred* the use varies, *an half* being found twice 296.13, 15, *a half* four times: 68.22, 30; 69.31; 99.30. — With *hundred* *a* and *an* are equally frequent, seven of each, e. g. *an hundred* Pounds 340.19; 73.6, etc; *a hundred* fold 339.4; 100 Lights (B *a hundred*) 211.20. — *An Horn* is met with once 60.33.

Before words of *Romanic* origin we find *a* used before *Habitation* 191.12, *Hatchet* 23.33; *horrible* 76.24; *Hypocrite* 133.37; — before *honest* 18.11, *Hour* (some fifteen times, e. g. 94.26), and *humble* 244.8 only *an* is used.

In one case *half an Hour* 282.23 *an* is altered to *a* in B. (In Ta. and Sp. *an* is, as far as I can see, the only occurring form before similar words. But even before words of *Germanic* origin *an* is by far the most frequent).

Before words beginning with a *vowel*: *an* as *an European*

¹ The same words are given by S. JOHNSON except *Humphrey, Hereditary*;

² *sounded softly* is added by WARD p. 103.

42.20; 243.25; 276.26 (*u* as *an universal*, ex. below¹) *an* is the only form occurring in all contemporary works.

Particularly noteworthy is the form of the indefinite article before *one*. While in RC we only meet with *a one*, e. g. 9.34; 149.23; 270.35, the form *an* is almost the rule in Sp. This phenomenon may possibly be put down to the arbitrariness of the printer, who just put in the *an* before the vowel without enquiring whether the *vowel sign* also represented the *vowel sound* or not. (cf. ESt. 17.281). But another explanation which seems to me much more probable is the following. In the early 18th century, or possibly shortly before, *thesé* and similar words were as a rule pronounced with a vowel (diphthong) and not a consonantal sound as in PE. (For further particulars I refer to Ekwall, Horn and NED). — The fact that Defoe in CG almost in the same line uses both *a* and *an* before *one* may be explained as due to the fact that the pronunciation of *one* was not yet settled.

¹ PY ten Ounces and *an half* 208; *an Hundred* 23, 116 (*a Hundred* 22); such *a one* 101; *an universal Infection* 224.

CS *an European* 46; such *an use* 35.

CG *a handsome ornament* 136; *a hundred* (always) 234, etc.; *a humble temper* 258; such *a one* was a good schollar and such *an one* was a man of sense 54.

TT *an Historian* 238; *an universal Plunder* 246; 248; 295.

Ta. *an Halt* 69.9; *an happy Expedient* 53.6; *an Heat* 181.4; *an Highwayman* 25.4; *an Humpback* 75.5; *an Hundred* 88.11; *an Harmony* 51.3; *an Humour* 181.2; *an uniform Temper* 51.5; *an useful subiect* 70.10.

Sp. *an handsome* 150.10; *an Hare* 56.3; 343.6; *an Hat* 38.2; *an Head* 110.1; *an Heart* 108.6; *an Hedge* 2.2; 106.1; *an Hen* 120.1; *an Hint* 38.10; *an huge Lion* 56.3; *an Hundred* 72.8; 122.3, etc. etc. — *an universal* 54.1; so familiar *an one* (Steele) 101.5; such *an one's Wife* 112.5; 122.5; 126.8, etc. etc.

For further particulars concerning the indefinite article, see FRANZ p. 93; STORM p. 1003; SWEET p. 352. For PE (vulg. and dial.) usage see among other places WRIGHT p. 258 and NED. — WILLIAMS *Our Dictionaries* has contributed a very large collection of inst. showing the present unsettled use of *a*, *an* before an unaccented H.

Concerning the use of *a. an* in RC and CG, REd. there is one thing I think well worth calling attention to. While in RC the instances of *an* used contrary to modern usage amount to no less than *fourteen*, in CG I have not been able to find more than *two* (and these 'before a vowel'); in REd. not a single one.

As these last mentioned works are with some few trifling exceptions accurate reproductions of the original MSS, I believe the inference, that many or most cases where *an* is used in Rc are due to the printer, and not to Defoe himself, ought not to be considered as a very bold one.

II. Substantives.

A. Plural of Substantives.

1.

Some Substantives denoting *measure, weight, time* and *number*: **Fathom, Foot, Mile, Pound, Tun** and **Year**; **Dozen** and **Pair**, are very often unchanged in the plural when preceded by a cardinal number.

As a rule these plural forms, that are mainly a relic from older stages of the language (see, e. g. Sweet p. 311), were still rather commonly occurring in the great authors of the 17th century, as Shakespeare and Bunyan.¹

¹ See SCHMIDT Sh. Lex.; SATTLER ESt. 16.39 ff. with a great many examples also from modern authors, where statistics of the forms occurring will be found; also FRANZ p. 28 and *Taalstudie* VI. 92 ff. where Prof. TEN BRUGGENCATE in a little paper *On the Plural of Substantives in English* gives many interesting views and examples (esp. from Sh.) of the use in modern English of words like the above mentioned. — For MnE usage

With the exception of *Fathom*, *Foot*¹ and *Tun*, that only occur unchanged in the plural, (*Foot*, some 20 examples, *Fathom* and *Tun* only those quoted) the plural forms in *s* are predominant, *Miles* and *Years* being found 15 and about 40 times resp., while of *Mile* and *Year* I have only come across 4 and 2 examples respectively. The frequency of *Pound* is almost as great at that of *Pounds* (8 to 10):

Forty-five *Fathom* of Land 149.8.

Two *Foot* Diameter 145.9; Twenty *Foot* Deep 151.6;
Five *Foot* and a Half 68.22, etc.

A distance of about two *Mile* 214.36; 173.21; three *Mile* 167.24; it was ten *Mile* about 173.23, etc. — Two *Miles* 115.10; near an hundred *Miles* 30.7: 150 *Miles* South of Sallee 26.14.

Five or six *Pound* 24.9; the other hundred *Pound* 45.12; two *Pound* of Tobacco 325.15; two *Pound* of Powder 84.30; 228.26; 212.20; six *Pound* of Gun-Powder 199.21; I had near sixty *Pound* of Powder 212.16 — this Hundred *Pounds* 41.30; four thousand *Pounds* Sterling 45.15: 4 *Pounds* of Powder 227.22.

Our Ship was about 120 *Tun* Burthen 46.19.

I went on Board in an evil Hour, being the same Day eight *Year* that I went from my Father 46.15; I had my Life saved 26 *Year* (B *Years*) after 157.25 — all this (B the) two *Years* 230.2, etc.²

see also FR. DIAL. 221 ff; STORM 777; SWEET I. 316; WRIGHT 263; also REUSCHI who has collected a considerable number of plurals like *hour*, *week*, *shilling*, etc. from Dickens, Bret Harte and Trollope.

¹ The Plural form *Feets* 278.34 (B *Feet*) must no doubt be looked upon as an oversight only.

² CS Twenty six *Fathom* water 13.

PY Two *Bushel* of Wheat 168; 200 *Chalder* of Coals 255; (in another ex. quoted in NED, Defoe uses the pl. form *Chalders*); They continued this wretched Course three or four *Day* after this 80; Forty *Foot* (always) 71; Some got five *Pound* 39; She lay in the Garret four *Story* high 62 he liv'd above 20 *Year* 105; three *Year* after the Plague was ceased 267.

MF She was twelve *Year* a Thief (from the title page).

Though in CG the proportion between *pound* and *pounds* seems to be much the same as in RC, the occurrence of the plural form *year* in CG and REd. (only 2 ex. in

REd, CG — Quite as in RC the unchanged plural forms *pound*, *year* only occur after cardinals:

at the end of *many yeares* (I think it was 5 *year*) CG 153.

In REd. no instances of *pound*-*pounds* are to be found.

In CG I have counted 8 plurals *pound* to 10 *pounds*:

how many thousand *pounds* do they come to 139; an hundred *pounds* a year 213; one thousand *pound* a year 65; 400 *pound* fortune 258.

On page 266 within ten lines there occur three instances of *pounds*: 'thirty thousand *pounds*; four hundred *pounds*; twelv thousand *pounds*'; and one of *pound*: 'three hundred thousand *pound*', which will clearly show the promiscuous use of the forms.

As to the relative use of *year* and *years*, the form *year* is in CG by far the commoner, 15 *year* to only 10 *years* (*yeares*) being found. — In REd. they seem to be equally divided: 7 of each, e. g.

CG 30 *years* later 101; those 4 *yeares* and half 207; a hundred *yeares* before 224; — for seaven *year* 205; four *year* and a half 212; 13 *year* old XVI; at 18 *year* old 269.

REd. at 6 *yeares* of age 57; 100 *yeares* after 9; — he was king six and fifty *year* 23; a child abov 5 *year* old 41; he came to the crown at IX *year* old 23.

TT Two *Foot* 142 = Sw. Let. 21 : 18 *Foot*; Three *Story* high 103; five *Miles* 41;

STEELE: Letter to Prue, Aug. 20th 1708: 'I have paid Mr. Addison his whole thousand *pound*' — some few lines further below: 'the afternoon coach shall bring you ten *pounds*'.

Sp. Five *Foot* 529.6 = *Ta.* 102.5; Four *Foot* 79.1; Fourscore *Pound* 274.3 (in a letter from a bawd);

In PC *pounds*, *years*, etc. are practically the only forms occurring the plural form *pound* being only found a single time:

a hundred *pound* 392.

In Ev. where in so many other respects we find specimens of the colloquial and vulgar language after the middle of the 18th cent. I have, in spite of much hunting for such forms, not been able to trace a single unchanged plural.

RC as in PY) is very great, though it seems the language, in which the forms are to be found, is in no way intended to represent any special style.

On account of the great dissimilarity existing as regards the occurrence of the plural *year* in RC and PY on the one hand, and CG and REd. on the other, whose texts were edited some years ago with but few immaterial changes, after Defoe's MSS, I think the supposition that the printer not considering these forms as quite good English changed them without any further ado into *years* (cf. 157.25: 26 *Year* > B *years*) should not be received as an out-of-the-way inference.

Dozen and *Pair* always occur unchanged in the plural:¹

two *Dozen* of my Loaves 224.17; 158.8, etc.

I found two *pair* more 229.2; two *Pair* of Gloves 325.24; 228.33, etc.

All other similar substantives belonging to this category take *s* in the plural:

80 *Barrels* 293.22; two *Bushels* of Rice two *Bushels* . . . and half af Barley 138.14; six *Days* 9.28; two *Furlongs* 353.34; six *Gallons* of Rack 57.29; three *Hours* 27.12; three *Leagues* 61.4; eight *Minutes* 93.29; three *Months* 40.31; 9 *Ounces* 18.33; three Runlets of Rum 64.27; an Hundred *Yards* 68.6, etc.

*

The grammars I have examined give very little information about these plurals. WALLIS is absolutely silent concerning them. LEDIARD (p. 312) gives the double plurals of *Pound*,

¹ Those who want to have some special information on PE use, which is still far from settled, I refer to JESP. STR. p. 190; POUTSMA 190 ff, and SATTLER: ESt. 16.39 ff. Besides NED and *Taalstudie* VI. 93, who all (esp. SATTLER) by a great multitude of instances taken from modern authors, show how matters stand at present.

Mile and *Tun* side by side with each other: 'Pound and Pounds, Pfünde. Mile and Miles, Meilen, Tun and Tuns, Tonnen', while GREENWOOD (p. 60) advances as his opinion that *Fish*, *Mile* are 'rather ill speaking; Ten *pound* is good English upon the old foot — — — But ten *pounds* is better English upon the modern analogy'.

ARNOLD (p. 32) *Von dem Numero Plurali* says that 'einige Worte werden in beyden Numeris gebrauchet als *Sheep*. . . *People*; ingleichen *Pair*, *Pound*, *Mile*, *Foot* (*Fussvolk*, *Fussvölker*), etc. 'Davon diese 12 letzten auch die Endung des Plur. annehmen'. But on page 77 *Vom Accusativo* in denoting measure, etc. he gives *six Foot long*; *two Fathom deep*; *fifty Years old*; *seven Leags distant*; *eight Shillings*; and in examples on the use of the prepositions (pp. 109, 110): *over two Month*; *500 Pound*.

As one would expect, JOHNSON in his grammar has as little to say on the subject as Wallis. In his Dictionary, however, he quotes; *three mile* (Sh.); *thousand Pound, sum of moncy* (Peacham); *fathoms* and *tuns* only; about *year* he calls attention to its being used plurally without a plural termination (ex. from Sh.) and informs us on *foot* that, when it signifies measure, it has often, but '*viciously*', *foot* in the plural. One of his contemporaries — WARD — mentions (p. 341) in connection with *deer*, *sheep*, etc. that '*Pound* is also used as a plural in the expressions *ten*, *twenty*, *an hundred pound*'.

2.

Some substantives, when used in a *collective*¹ sense often remain unchanged in the plural, such as **acquaintance**,

¹ After cardinals the inflected form in *-s* is practically the only one occurring:

I also loaded my Pistols with about four *Bullets* each 200.37; Six large *Candles* 211.9; My two broken *Oars* 60.16; Two *Pistols* 63.36, etc.; cf. *Shot*.

ball, bullet, cannon, shot, pistol, oar, basket, rusk, candle, provision, tortoise, turtle.¹

I concluded I should make some *Acquaintance*, or find some Relations 341.16; I had not many Relations nor had I contracted much *Acquaintance* 362.3.

Note. In some cases it is very difficult to determine whether *Acquaintance* is to be looked upon as used in a collective sense or whether it has a purely abstract signification.

The collective form is by far the commoner, the plural form in *s* being only once met with:

Among all my Relations, or *Acquaintances*, I could not pitch upon one 340.28;

They had neither Powder or *Ball*. 289.13; eight Charges of Powder and *Ball* 294.32; here are three Muskets with Powder and *Ball* 303.30;

No instance of *Balls* found.

I let him into the Mystery of Gunpowder and *Bullet* 263.13; I gave Friday a Bag with Powder and *Bullet* 274.35.

In all other (6) cases only *Bullets*, e. g.:

two Barrels of Musket *Bullets* 62.31; as big as Pistol *Bullets* 273.37.

Cannon and *Shot* never occur with plural inflection, the latter not even after a cardinal:

¹ PY they were able to supply with charitable *Provision* the Wants of many Thousands 257; and perhaps to get their Substinence going about for *Provision* the Infection got in among them 133; — what quantity of *Provisions* will you send us 159, 69; 92, 93.

But we have no *Acquaintance*, no Friends 143; they . . . having no *Acquaintance* or Relations to fly to, were fled further 163;

TT Send as many of your *Acquaintance* as you will 186.

Sp. She is impertinently Blunt to all her *Acquaintance* 79.9. This Declaration was followed by my being denied to all my *Acquaintance* 212.1.

I loaded all my *Cannon* . . . that is to say my Muskets . . . all my Pistols 215.18; — I was loath to spend our last *Shot* too hastily 357.27; They had so well aim'd their *Shot* at the Men they knew 304.34, etc. (Cf. KRÜGER I. 19). — Friday made three *Shot* at them 281.10.

I order'd my last *Pistol* to be fir'd off in one *Volley* 358.9.

Only this instance, else *Pistols*:

we fir'd two *Volleys* of our *Pistols* 357.23; 215.18, etc.¹

The following are the only instances of *oar*, *oars* occurring in RC:

The Men labouring at the *Oar* to bring the Boat near the Shore 14.8; We work'd at the *Oar* towards the Land, pulling as well as we could 50.6; I began to think how I should get to Shore with them, having neither Sail, *Oar*, or Rudder 58.24.

When we had carry'd all these Things on Shore (the *Oars*, Mast, Sail and Rudder were carry'd before) we . . . 307.27; 305.23.

Of *Bisket* and *Rusk* no plural forms in *-s* are found:

he brought a large Basket of *Rusk* or *Bisket* of their kind 23.23; I fill'd my Pockets with *Bisket*, and eat it . . . 56.15; The next Thing was that of my Bread, I mean the *Bisket* which . . ., this I husbanded to the last degree 157.29;

The mutual relation between *Candle-Candles* is the same as with *Bullet-Bullets*: 2 to 6.

I was at a great Loss for *Candle* 90.2; Having no *Candle*, I gave it over, but resolv'd to come again the next Day provided with *Candles* 211.3.

the Lump of Bees-wax with which I made *Candles* 90.5, 211.10, etc.

¹ For PE usage with similar substantives see esp. KRÜGER and SWEET II. 44.

Provisions is a little commoner than *Provision*, the proportion being as 11 to 7:

He resolved he would not go a fishing without some *Provision* 22.9, 213.32; I began to starve for *Provision* 187.4, 234.4; they brought me a great deal more of their *Provision* 35.11; the first of these Chests I fill'd with *Provision* (B *Provisions*) 57.18.

A larger Store of their *Provisions* 309.36. I made the other two carry *Provisions* 321.26. he heard . . . the Manner of my being furnish'd with *Provisions* (B *Provisions*) and Ammunition 305.35.

While *tortoise* only occurs in the singular form, *turtle* and *turtles* are used alternately:

I had *Tortoise* or *Turtles* enough 152.4. I had no Want of Food especially these three Sorts, viz. Goats, Pidgeons and *Turtle* or *Tortoise* 128.33. I could not have so much as got any Food, except Fish and *Turtles* 154.10.

*

To judge from the grammars I usually refer to, this collective use of the words above mentioned seems to have been totally overlooked, or at least not considered worth calling attention to.

The only statement referring to this phenomenon is given by S. JOHNSON who in his dictionary under *Acquaintance*:

'The Person with whom we are acquainted; him of whom we have some knowledge, without the intimacy of friendship' says: 'In this sense the plural is, in some authors *acquaintance*, in others *acquaintances*'. —

For further particulars see CD; NED; Krüger 1.19, and Sweet I. 315, II. 44.

B. Gender.

The use of the personal gender with regard to animals, esp. higher and domestic ones, and sometimes also with regard to the names of things, does not essentially deviate from present day English.

Thus **Dog**, **Goat**, **Horse**; **Bear**, **Lyon**, **Wolf**, are generally spoken of as *masculine*; while **Cat**, **Turtle**; **Boat**, **Mainmast** and **Ship** are feminine.

a *Dog*,¹ who² . . . I gave *him* a Cake, and *he* eat it
226.17;

the old *Goat* who . . . cover *him* . . . drag *him* out
212.30;

the *Wolf* that had fastned upon the *Horse*, left *him* . . .
upon *his* Head 347.29;

Bear . . . if you meet *him*, *he* won't meddle with you
348.26;

a *Lyon* . . . I shot *him* 31.17 . . . the Hide of *him*
32.7;

Friday went close up to *him* and shot *him* (the *Wolf*) 347.15.

a Wild *Cat* . . . *she* sat . . . I presented my Gun at

her 63.10, 83.36;

the *Turtle* . . . I found in *her* . . . and *her* Flesh was
100.34;

my *Boat* . . . to get *her* about the Island 176.4;

the *Main-Mast* . . . they were obliged to cut *her* away
11.32;

the *Ship* . . . seeing *her* sit upright 81.26.

With others **Kid**, **Parrot**³, the use is not quite settled, the masc. and fem. gender being used promiscuously:

¹ I need not say, that I could give many more ex. of every word, but I think one of each will do.

² Cf. Introduction p. 10

³ Cf. STORM p. 1018 quoting an extract from a letter from SWEET: 'a dog is *he* and a *cat* *she*, a *parrot* is *she*'.

a *Kid* . . . I led *him* and enclos'd *him* 131.3; I had kept a young *Kid*, and bred *her* up tame 171.10;

a young *Parrot* . . . I could make *him* speak 128.20; The *Parrot* was flutter'd from the Place where *she* fell 251.15.

*

It is very interesting to see Defoe's varying application of gender as to animals. When spoken of in their wild state they are generally referred to as neuter, e. g.:

my Dog surpriz'd a young *Kid*, and seiz'd upon *it*, I caught *it*, and sav'd *it* alive from the Dog 130.29.

But as soon as he gets a little more familiar with the animal, he gives it a personal gender, as:

I came to my Bower, and there I enclos'd *him* 131.5.

I did catch a young *Parrot*, for I knock'd *it* down with a Stick, and having recover'd *it*, I brought *it* home; but it was some years before I could make *him* speak: However, at last I taught *him* to call me by Name 128.17.

And when the bird has got a name of its own nothing but the personal gender is used:

I quickly learn'd *him* to know *his* own Name 140.30; I saw *Poll* and knew that it was *he* that spoke 168.24, etc.

*

The principal intention of Defoe in giving the personal gender to animals and things was no doubt to give a more homely and familiar touch to his diction; cf. PE. The use of the relative pronoun *who* in similar cases may also be looked upon from this point of view. — For a detailed investigation of questions connected with the use of personal gender with such substantives as those treated above, particularly to indicate the higher or lower position of a certain object in the scale of rank, see Franz p. 42 ff; Storm p.

776, 1017; Sweet II. 42 and esp. Norseen, *Vårt Språk*, V. 302 ff. where this question has been treated with great thoroughness.

III. Adjectives.

Comparison of Adjectives.

A. Regular Comparison.

As will be clear from the very numerous instances quoted by Storm, page 682 ff. (further ex. in Koch, Mätzner and ESt. 17.225) and from those given by myself below, the MnE mode of comparison, as far as it is settled, at least in the written standard prose, and propounded in the grammars of our day, differs in no small degree from the English of the classical authors of the beginning of the 18th century¹.

Several of the examples quoted by Storm may possibly belong to the spoken language of the day; but I think many of the forms referred to will not often be found in good PE writers, or even heard in the speech of educated persons. — To judge from the instances I have found in Ev. the PE

¹ For information as to the comparison of adjectives in the 16—17 cent. see ABBOTT p. 21; FRANZ p. 54; VODOZ p. 78, and especially Miss POUND's dissertation, where many questions connected with the history of the comparison of adjectives in English are dealt with. — As regards the opinions and the different rules of comparison given by PE grammarians see KRÜGER III. 85; STORM p. 685 and POUND p. 5 ff. where we find quotations from a great number of modern grammars, etc. — On PE colloq., vulgar and dial. use see STORM pp. 682, 778, etc.; FR. DIAL. p. 230 and WRIGHT p. 267.

tendency of restricting the inflectional mode of comparison to monosyllables and certain dissyllables seems to have been already prevalent after the middle of the century. Forms now commonly considered as belonging to very careless speech, are there only used in decidedly vulgar style.

*

In the works of Defoe and his contemporaries which I have examined, the periphrastic mode of comparison of real adjectives is decidedly predominant. — In RC, for instance, I have counted no less than twenty-two instances of it; with participles and adverbs only the periphrastic mode with *more*, *most* is used, e. g.:

nothing could be *more terrible* 105.11; it might have been *more miserable* 132.10; — the *most pleasant* Place 164.24; the *most delightful* I ever saw 8.27; the *most desperate* Condition I ever had been in 220.26; the *most miserable* of all Conditions 38.20, etc. etc. — the *most hardned* Wretch 9.35; the *most suited* State; this *more perfectly* amused him 319.14.

On the other hand we find no small number of adjectives compared according to the inflectional mode of comparison, many of which cannot be looked upon as indisputably belonging to the standard English of our day:¹

a little *pleasanter* than ordinary 5.29; much *pleasanter* 129.33 — the *bitterest* Providences 175.1; the *dismallest* Howling 547.22; the *pleasantest* Year 253.4 — the *difficultest* thing 71.7; the *miserablest* Wretch 6.26; the *unhappiest* Voyage 19.12.²

* * *

¹ I need hardly say that under the examples of inflectional comparison I only give such adjectives as in some way or other differ from the rules given by our modern English grammarians or have been discussed by them.

² **CS** The *horridest* Yell 69; — **MF** *handsomest* 15; — **PY** *honester* Men 78; the *worst* and *ordinaricest* 79; the *hardnedest* Creatures 42.

If we now pass on to examine the statements in the grammars of the 17th and 18th centuries, we shall find that the distinctions in usage between the two ways of comparison, propounded in our modern grammars, did not appear till the beginning of the 18th cent.

WALLIS's statements p. 74 'De Comparationibus' are not particularly instructive. Noteworthy is at any rate his comparing the English periphrastic comparison with the Latin comparison with *magis*, *maxime*, possibly inferring that this has influenced the English:

'Gradus Comparativus formatur a Positivo addendo *er*; Superlativus addendo *est*. Ut *fair* formosus, *fairest* formosior, *fairest* formosissimus. Sed et uterque gradus per circumlocutionem formantur, *ut apud Latinos*;¹ ut, *more fair*, *most fair*, *very fair*, *magis* formosus, *maxime* formosus, *valde* formosus'.

The first rough attempt at setting up any distinction in the usage of comparison I have found in MAITTAIRE (1712) p. 43: 'The Comparative and the Superlative are made by adding *-er* and *-est* to the Positive; as *great*, *greater*, *greatest*. Some Adjectives, such especially as are derived from the

CG they may be *honester*; these are *honester* times 95; the *beautifullest* and best improv'd language 122; his *pleasantest* yeares 115; the *properest* method 196; the question whether the learned or the unlearned world are the *wickedest* 171.

TT nothing *backwarder* 210; *profounder* Antiquaries 23; the *Profoundest* and *most* universal Subjects 143.

Sp. the *rigider* Part 266.1; the *honestest* Fellow 88.6.

Ev. nothing *eleganter* I.128 (D); *wonderfuller* things II.170 (D); the *disagreeablest* thing II.41 (D); the *impudentest* tellow II.31 (D); the *impudentest* thing II.142 (D); the *miserablest* creature II.64 (D); the *tiresomest* thing I.94 (D); the *unluckiest* thing II.35 (D); — the *becomingest* cap II.40 (D); the *surprisingest* part II.66 (D); the *unthinkingest* manner II.65 (D); the *ill-bredest* creature I.78 (D).

But the *most able* I.189; the *most profound* III.27, etc. as used by well-bred people.

¹ The italics are mine.

Latin, or end in *-us* pure, are compared by the signs *more*, *most*: as *prudent* from *prudens*, *more prudent*, *most prudent* (*harshly and very rarely prudenter, prudentest*); *necessary* from *necessarius*, *more necessary*, *most necessary*; *pious* from *pius*, *more pious*, *most pious*.

LEDIARD is, as far as I can see, the first to give us a detailed account of the comparison of adjectives. Having given some examples of inflectional comparison: *holy*, *holier*, *holiest*, *merry*, *merrier*, *merriest*, he continues p. 334:

'Viele zwey und mehrsilbige Adjectiva und in sonderheit die sich auf *-al* *-ant* *-ary* *-ate* *-ent* *-full* *-oly* *-ory* *-ous* und *some* endigē exprimiren den Comparativum und Superlativum mit Hülfe der Adverbien *more-most* e. g. *prodigal*, *more prodigal*, *most prodigal*, *fragant*, *wary*, *obstinate*, *tiresome* u. s. w'. On page 327 however we find such forms as *foolishest*, *godliest*, *wickedest*.

While here both the length and ending of the adj. are decisive for the mode of comparison, in GREENWOOD the periphrastic comparison seems to depend only on the ending. After mentioning the inflectional comparison with *-er*, *-est* he writes (p. 113.):

'But *Adjectives*, such chiefly as come from the *Latin*,¹ and that end in *ain*, as *certain*; in *ive*, as *fugitive*; in *cal*, as *Angelical*; in *en*, as *Golden*; in *ly*, as *Fatherly*; in *less*, as *Friendless*; in *ry*, as *Necessary*; in *Al* as *General*; *Able* as *Commendable*; *Ing* as *Loving*; *Ish* as *Peevish*; *Est* as *Honest*; *Ous* as *Vertuous*; *Ant* as *Constant*; *Ent* as *Excellent*; *Ible* as *Visible*; *Ed* as *Wicked*; *Id* as *Rigid*; *Some* as *Troublesome*; Form or make the *Comparative Degree* by putting the word *More* before them, and the *Superlative* by putting the word *Most* before them. Except *Able* and *Handsome*, which are compared according to the Rule.'

Words like *learned*, *natured*, he says, are compared by the words *better* and *best*. Here I think we find expressed his opinion of the comparison of participles in general.

If we now at last turn to S. JOHNSON and WARD (p.

¹ As in MAITTAIRE this statement is no doubt due to their using both the same authority: WALLIS.

347) we shall find in their statements such a striking accordance that we cannot help suspecting that one of them must have copied the other. According to them *all* adjectives may be compared by *more*, *most*.¹ Monosyllables, however, 'are commonly compared by *-er*, *-est*.' Polysyllables are seldom compared otherwise than by *more*, *most*. Dissyllables, they state, are seldom compared if they terminate in certain endings, and these endings are almost the same as those given in Greenwood. — The following statements of Dr. Johnson give us some notion of the unsettled state of the comparison of adjectives in the early 18th century: — 'The comparison of adjectives is very uncertain; and being much regulated by commodiousness of utterance, or agreeableness of sound, is not easily reduced to rules. — Some comparatives and superlatives are yet found in good writers formed without regard to the foregoing rules; but in a language subjected so little and so lately to grammar, such anomalies must frequently occur'.

B. Double Comparison.

During the first two centuries of the MnE period the use of the double comparison was very common. In the course of the 17th century, however, its use was growing less and less common (see Dc Vere p. 236; Pound p. 49 ff. and Franz p. 56) and in all the works of the classical authors from the beginning of the 18th century (also Dryden), I have only found one example of its occurrence, viz. in Defoe's RC (B):

¹ Here JOHNSON has a note: 'In adjectives that admit a regular comparison, the comparative *more* is oftener used than the superlative *most*, as *more fair*, is oftener written for *fairer*, than *most fair* for *fairest*'.

if he goes abroad he will be the *most miserablest* Wretch that ever was born 6.26.¹

The above facts may be considered quite sufficient to refute Miss Pound's statement (p. 51) that the 'Intensification of terminational comparatives by prefixing *more* and *most* is lasting into the eighteenth century in literary English'. But I will here call attention to a few other facts. In the edition of Shakespeare's works which ROWE published in 1709 he undertook, besides other more or less happy emendations and changes of the text, to remove instances of double comparison, e. g. *more better*, etc.

The same procedure was adopted by POPE in his edition of Shakespeare (printed for Tonson 1725) where, for instance, *more sounder*, *most poorest*, etc. are changed into *sounder*, *poorest*, etc.; cf. Franz p. 56.

I think these facts are a conclusive proof that these editors considered the original forms as not being quite correct. And indeed, if any examples at all occur in the 18th century English, they are, as far as I can ascertain, only used to represent the language of vulgar persons². Thus in EV. the author makes only the exceedingly vulgar Madame Duval use this form of speech.³ This opinion is also confirmed by two grammarians from the beginning of the 19th century. The author of *Vulg. corr.* says p. 204 that 'Nothing is more common, nor more offensive to those who are well educated, than such very incorrect and vulgar expressions as *more greater*; *most beautifullcst*; *more prettier*; *most commonest*;

¹ Perhaps it may be thought that I have gone to too much trouble for this single passage, but I hope future students will acknowledge my contribution towards the refutation of Miss Pound's unfounded statement.

² Cf. STORM p. 949.

³ EV. I would have you learn to be *more politer* I.97; it i'n't the *less provokinger* for that II.43; so much the *worser* I.122; — The *most cruellest* thing II.14; the *most dullest* place II.63; the *most impertinentest* person II.6; the *most impudentest* person II.153; this is the *most provokingest* pair of all II.151; the *most rudest* boy II.169.

and many other phrases of the same kind'. — After referring to PEGGE (pp. 94—96), whose views on this question are in perfect agreement with those given above, he quotes a great number of similar instances, especially out of Shakespeare.¹

IV. Numerals.

The OE mode of placing the units before the tens, nowadays fairly seldom² adopted, was of frequent occurrence in Defoe's time; cf. German. As far as I can see, such cumulative groups as *one and twenty*, etc. seem actually to be the only forms employed in RC:

all of *one and twenty* 280.30; 274.9; *two or three and twenty* Years 267.32; 337.22; *six and twenty* (B 26) Years 270.21; *two and forty* Days 135.8, 174.14 etc.; cf: *thirty and five* Years 330.21; — in my *four and twentieth* Year 218.29; the *four and twentieth* Year 231.29; the *seven and twentieth* Year 271.34.³

¹ In pres. vulgar English, and esp. in the dialects (WRIGHT 267) where *more* and *most* are as a rule only used to supplement or intensify the regular comparison, as *more beautifuller*, *most beautifullest*, *most worst*, the comparative and the superlative suffix *-er* *-est* being added to practically all adjectives, polysyllabic as well as monosyllabic, the double comparison is still very frequently occurring. Cf. STORM 778; FR. DIAL. 230.

² For further information see esp. ESt. 17.387; FRANZ p. 68; SWEET p. 362.

³ RED. he was king *six and fifty* year 23.

TT *one and twenty* Days 115; cf: seven hundred *forty and three* Persons 15.

Ta. the *four and twenty* Letters 242.6; *eight and twenty* Farthings 29.12.

Sp. *four and twenty* Books 59.2; at the Age of *Two and twenty* 89.2; the next *Four and twenty* Hours 454.1; She drilled him on to *five and fifty* 89.1, etc.

V. Pronouns.

A. Personal Pronouns.

1. Thou.

The use of *thou* etc., as shown by the instances given, corresponds entirely with the statements of the various grammarians, it being used either as a mark of familiarity, intimacy or affection¹, and sometimes even to give a touch of superiority or condescension towards the person spoken to, or as expressing the highest degree of 'Contempt, Anger, Disdain'. In this latter use it is often found together with an abusive word. — It is often interesting to notice the interchange of *thou*, gen. in the beginning of an address, and *you* as the conversation goes on, to mark the different shades of feeling and emotion of the speaker, e. g.:

1. Alas! Friday, (says I), *thou* knowest not what *thou* say'st; (two lines below) Friday, says I, *you* shall go without me 268.21; Now Friday, do as I bid *thee*, (next line) do as *you* see me do 277.10; O happy Desart, I shall never see *thee* more 164.29.²

¹ Such inst. as *Jesus thou*, etc. 113.5, 133.15, etc. where *thou* should still be used nowadays will not be mentioned.

² MF *Thou* foolish Child, prithee, what do'st cry for 5; I wish *thou* (his sister) hadst half her Stock of both for *thy* Portion 40.

PY Master, save *thy* self 11; Poor Man, how much hast *thou* gotten 125; *thou* hast . . . *thy* self 126; Well, did *you* leave . . . *you* said . . . Hark *thee*, Friend, said I, come hither; for I believe *thou* art in Health, that I may venture *thee* 127 (to a 'poor Waterman'). — See my remark under the ex. quoted from Sp. concerning the use of *thee* in the nom.

TT You my Children dear and *thou* my beauteous Sister 257; I can assure *thee* courteous Reader . . . 213. — Cf. JONES 140: If *thou* (the reader) wilt have . . . *you* may.

2. Seeing all these Things have not brought *thee* to Repentance, *thou* shalt die 102.30; How canst *thou* be

Ta. Isaac, said he, *thou* art too late (Steele) 25.8; Jack, *thou* hast a Head, and so has a Pin (to a servant) 83.9; *Thou* dear *Will Shoestring!* I profess my self in Love with *thee* . . . Will *you* be combing your Whig . . . Or chusest *thou* rather to be . . . 38.10; I pray *thee* Friend, as *thou* art . . . (in a letter from a quaker) 72.

Sp. O, *thou* (the young maiden) dear Picture, if *thou* . . . that fair Creature *you* represent (Steele) 118.2; Is it no Consolation to such a Man as *thou* art to dye with Phocion (Steele) 133.2; I suppose this Letter will find *thee* picking of Daisies *thou* wilt . . . thy Conversations . . . *thine* Eternally Will Honeycomb 131.9; 499.5, etc. — My good Friend, *thee* and I are to part . . . When two such as *thee* and I meet . . . *thou* shouldst rejoice 132.4.

*

The last passage is put into the mouth of a Quaker, in whose language *thee* must have been the prevailing nom. form in the 18th cent., judging at least from the fol. statement in PEGGE (1844) p. 131: 'a Quaker rarely says *I hope thou art well; wilt thou come and dine with me?*' but *I hope thee are well, will thee, etc.*' — For further particulars, even as to PE dial. use, see esp. JESPERSEN p. 266 ff.; WRIGHT p. 272.

Ev. if *thou* hast, pry'thee give it us (to the conductor of a museum) I. 128 (c).

*

The contracted form *prethee* which seems to have survived in ordinary conversation right up to the first half of the 19th century (cf. STORM p. 628), occurs occasionally in passages which no doubt represent the standard English of the time. — In PC and Ev., on the other hand, this form is extremely common, the same as such forms as *harkee, lookee, thankee* which latter, however, only occur in the speech of the vulgar characters; cf. p. 53. For instance:

MF *Thou* foolish Child, *Prithee*, what do'st cry for 5.

CG Change? *prethee* what hav you to change 56; *Prethee*, says my Lord 163.

Ta. Why, *prithee* Isaac . . . You 53.10; a Gentleman whispered me, *Prithee*, Isaac . . . 75.10; *Prithee* Jack, says I (Steele) if *thou* aimest . . . I have heard *thee* 206.2.

Sp. *Prithee*, don't send any more Stories (Will Honeycomb) 131.9

G. Lannert.

such a Hypocrite 133.37; Unhappy Wretch, I would not set my Foot in the same Ship with *thee* for a Thousand Pounds 16.1; Wretch! dost *thou* ask what *thou* hast done . . . ask *thy self* what *thou* hast not done? ask Why is it that *thou* wert not long ago destroy'd? Why perish'd but *thy self*, etc. 108.31—109.2; O Drug! what art *thou* good for, *Thou* art not worth to me . . . I have no Manner of use for *thee*, e'en remain where *thou* art 65.5.¹

In all other cases only *you*, as:

I turn'd to the Boy . . . Xury; if *you* 25.24; *You Fool* 349.19; *You Dog* 350.20, etc.; — Cf. Sp. 242.2: *you* lye, *you* Slut.

Among the grammars examined by me WALLIS is the first to mention the occurrence of *you* in the second pers. sing. His opinion as to this is expressed by the following remarkable and very interesting passage (p. 76), being, as far as I can see, the first of its kind found in all the grammars of the 17th century, to indicate any distinction between both *thou*-*you*, and *you*-*ye*: 'Notandum item apud nos morem obtinuisse (sicut apud Gallos aliasque nunc dierum) dum quis alium alloquitur, singularem licet, numerum tamen pluralem adhibendi; verum tunc *you* dicimus non *ye*. Singulare

PC But, *prithee*, Sir John 452, etc.

Ev. *Prithee*, whispered his lordship III. 7, 8, 175; But *pry'thee* friend . . . will you I. 127, 134, etc. (c).

¹ CS *Thou* art born to do a World of Mischief; *Thou* hast commenc'd Pyrate very young 33; *thou* wilt be an eminent Thief 34.

TT What art *thou* but a Vagabond . . . Born to no Possession of *your* own . . . *Your* Livelihood is an universal Plunder 246; Miscreant Prater, Eloquent only in *thine* own Eyes, *Thou* railest . . . The Malignity of *thy* Temper perverteth Nature. Courts have taught *thee* ill Manners, etc. 269.

Ta. I am come (quoth he) to insult *thee*, as *thou* art . . . (but in the continuation) *you* . . . (Steele) 266.2.

Ev. O wretch, cried he, in what dungeon canst *thou* hide *thy* head III. 222.

vero numero si quis alium compellet, vel dignantis illud esse solet, vel familiariter blandientur'.¹ — Much the same opinion is expressed by COOPER p. 122.

The grammars from the earlier part of the 18th century give practically fully concordant opinions as to the employment of *thou*-*you*. — MAITTAIRE (p. 50) says that 'common speech and civility in modern language uses the plurals *you*, *your*, *yours* instead of the singulars *thou*, *thy*, *thine*', and BRIGHTLAND asserts that 'by Custom we say *you* when we but speak to one Person, *thou* being seldom us'd but to God, and on solemn occasions to Princes . . . otherwise *thou* is never us'd but in Contempt, Anger, Disdain or Familiarity'. — Quite the same view is taken by GREENWOOD p. 119.

LEDIARD certainly mentions the use of *thou* in the above cases, but the following quotation shows clearly that upon the whole he does not seem to deviate in his opinion from present day standard English: ² 'Heutiges Tages braucht man durchgehends *you* so wohl pluraliter als singulariter. Es giebt zwar in England . . . Quakers . . . bei welchen es fast ein Glaubens-Artickel ist allezeit in Sec. Pers. Sg. *thou* zu sprechen . . . ist affectiert . . . sie sind hierinnen keinesweges zu folgen'.

These above statements, expressed by the grammarians from the beginning of the 18th century, agree on the whole with the opinions and views taken by S. Johnson and Ward.

With the great essayists of the day the use of *thou* seems to have been in no great favour. In the following passage in the *Tatler* 254 I think ADDISON has quite clearly

¹ Already at the end of the 16th cent. *you* was the commonly used pronoun in the common speech of the higher classes and the middle class. With the lower, uneducated people *thou* was still prevalent. This state of things will be explained by the fact that *you*, influenced by French custom, (cf. the statement of WALLIS) was originally used as a mere courteous form of addressing a single person. Cf. JESP. STR. p. 236; FRANZ p. 109.

² For particulars as to PE use see esp. BRADLEY p. 62; JESPERSEN p. 260 ff.; JESP. STR. p. 235 ff.; SWEET p. 342; WRIGHT p. 272.

expressed his opinion on it: — . . . 'seeing a Book in his Hand . . . it was the Quakers Religion. Upon Perusal, I found it to be nothing but a new-fashioned Grammar. The principal of his Pronouns was Thou; and as for You, Ye and Yours, I found they were not looked upon as Parts of Speech in this Grammar. All the Verbs wanted the second Person Plural . . . '

One gets the same impression, regarding the use of *thou*, from STEELE'S description (Sp. 132) of the dispute between 'Ephraim the Quaker' and 'the military Captain'. The Quaker only uses *thou* or *thee* (see note p. 49), the captain, on the other hand, only *you*; at the end of the dispute, however, when begging the quaker's pardon for his bad behaviour, 'the Captain with an happy and uncommon Impudence cries, Faith, Friend, I thank *thee*; I should have been a little Impertinent, if *thou* hadst not reprimanded me. Come, *thou* art, I see, a smoaky old Fellow'. — And in fact, with the exception of those papers where the elderly and rather old-fashioned beau Will Honeycomb is introduced as writing or speaking, instances of *thou* are very scarce in Sp.

With hardly more than a couple of exceptions the use of *thou*, *you* in Ev. seems practically to coincide with PE custom; (see notes pp. 49, 50).

2. Ye.

While in other works of Defoe and his contemporaries *ye* is met with very frequently (both in a stressed and unstressed position), the instances found in RC are comparatively few and only occur in an enclitical position after a verb. Cf. Greenwood's statement below.

What are *ye*, Gentlemen 301.16; — Bob, d'*ye* see what charming Weather 'tis now 9.7; Let her alone, Jack, cant *ye* 300.12; Hark *ye*, hark *ye* (the Bear) says Friday 349.32.¹

In all other similar imperatives *you* is the only form employed in Defoe's works, e. g.:

¹ PY What d'*ye* want, that *ye* make such a knocking (to the Watchman 'with an angry, quick Tone') 59; What do *ye* want? says the Centi-

RC Look *you* Sir, said I 305.5, etc. — [PY Why, look *you* 165; CG Look *you* Sir, says the gentleman 140].

With regard to the use of *ye*, when applying to only one person, it is well worth noting that the current usage of the
— What do *ye* intend to do? says the Constable. [But then during
the course of the conversation only *you* is used] 157; — what are *ye*
doing here (to 'two pilfering Women') 103; Hark *ye*, good People, says
the Joyner 151.

CG how do *ye* make out that 45; A commission d'*ye* call it? What
d'*ye* mean by that 49; 275; d'*ye* think I had not... 119; Look *ye*, Sir, it's
no matter what they are 139 — What d'*ye* think of that 47; But harke
ye Sir, how come *you* to understand Latin 188. — [The last is said by
the author himself, the last but one is put into the mouth of the educated
younger brother].

TT O *Ye* Eyes, *Ye* blind Guides, miserable Guardians are *Ye* of
our frail Noses 200; Look *ye*, Gentlemen, cries Peter 106.

Ta. To put them to the Trial, Look *Ye*, said I 34.4.

Sp. The how-d'*ye* servants of our women 143.3; Monsieur What-
d'*ye*-call him's Domesticks 481.2; 4.2.

PC and Ev. abound with examples:

PC Why then, John, d'*ye* see, if you are sure... d'*ye* mark...
441; 417; 456; Lord What-d'*ye*-call him 398; 459; Thank *ye*, Colonel 379;
439; here's t'ye 443; 454, etc. etc.

Ev. if thou hast, pry'thee give it us, for d'*ye* see I. 128; I. 207 (c);
Hark *ye*, hast never another pine apple I. 128 (c); Why, look *ye*, Madam,
You may I. 97 (c), etc.

*

With the exception of a couple of instances in Ta., one of which (38.9) no doubt is intended to take off the speech of a 'Courtier' whose 'Levity of Mind is visible in his every Word and Gesture', the contracted forms *harkee*, *lookee*, *thankee* occur only in very careless or vulgar speech. For instance:

Ta. And *harkee*, No Names 38.9; *Look'ee* Jack, I have heard thee
talk like an oracle 206.2.

PC *Harkee*, You fellow; d'*ye* hear... 422; No, *thankee* 441, etc.

Ev. *Hark'ee* Miss Anville, I've a favour for to ask of you II. 62 (c);
Hark'ee, my spark III.2.47 (c); Why, *look'ee*, Madam, if you I. 210 (c);
Look'ee, Monsieur, this here may be a French fashion I. 207 (c).

language, as shown by the examples given, deviates so considerably from the statements and views expressed by contemporary grammarians.

In the same manner as the grammarians of the first half of the 17th century — Gill and Ben Jonson — so does WALLIS in his grammar no longer insist on the old case difference between *ye*-*you* which occurs, for example, in the Bible (see Storm p. 1001). The following statement of his (p. 79 *De Pronominibus*) must undoubtedly be considered as a fully adequate expression of his real opinion in this respect: ‘Secundam Personam designat *thou* *tu*, in obliquo *thee* . . .; Pluraliter (tam in recto quam obliquo) *ye*, *you* *vos*.’ — In my opinion only a limited value may be placed upon his *Synopsis* of ‘omnia Pronomina’ found on page 77, and his paradigms of verbs (p. 84), when it is a question of determining what was in Wallis’s time, and by himself, considered current English. The only thing worth noting in his paradigms are the forms of the second person singular: ‘*You will* (thou wilt), *you shall* (thou shalt)’. In the plural only *ye will*, etc.; cf. p. 50.

BRIGHTLAND and GREENWOOD give in the plural ‘*you and ye; tho*’ by Custom we say *you* when we speak but to one particular Person’. This is also the opinion advanced by LEDIARD p. 346: ‘aus diesem *ye* singulariter gebraucht ist erstlich *you* geworden; da man dann zur Distinction sich des *ye* Plur. bedient’. Cf. my quotation from him p. 51.

The following statement by Greenwood (p. 119) as to the use of *ye* — the only one of its kind I have come across in all the grammars examined — is very interesting as it agrees on the whole with my examples: ‘We seldom use *ye* before the Verb, unless by Way of Distinction, Familiarity or Contempt: As, *Ye are the Men*: But it is oftener used after the *Verb* or *Preposition*: As, *I will give Ye a Taste of it*: *And I will go away from ye*’.

Already in the middle of the century *ye* was no doubt considered quite oldfashioned. — JOHNSON states that ‘*you* is commonly used in modern writers for *ye*, particularly in the language of ceremony, where the second person plural is

used for the second person singular, *You are my friend*', concerning which WARD is still more explicit, saying that '+ *ye* seldom appears' (and then only in the plural) 'except in the solemn stile of the Scriptures'.¹

3. 'Em.

'Em, the orig. unstressed form of *hem*, which nowadays is still preserved, but only in very familiar, vulgar and dial. speech,² enjoyed in Defoe's day a much higher reputation among the classical authors, as will be seen from the examples quoted.³ There are many facts to corroborate my supposition. Even if many of the ex. in the printed works (cf. Sp. Index) may be laid at the printer's door, I dare say that MSS of those days will give the requisite confirmation.

CG abounds with examples. Those under I. are Defoe's own; and then, even if those under II. are put into the mouths of 'country gentlemen', one cannot from this draw any inference as to its colloquial, still less vulgar character.

SWIFTS censure upon the use of 'em (*um*) in the Tatler 230⁴ does not prove anything beyond the fact as to how widespread it was; it only shows his own prejudice against the use of any abbreviations.

In BRIGHTLAND, who no doubt went over the proofs himself, the form is most frequently met with, e. g. 'You

¹ For further information (even concerning PE usage) see esp. JESPERSEN: Case-shiftings in the pronouns; SPIES p. 101 ff.; SWEET p. 342; WRIGHT p. 273.

² See FRANZ DIAL. p. 223; STORM p. 779; SWEET p. 342; WRIGHT p. 24.

³ The ex. given are but a very small portion of all I have collected from the various authors. *Them* is however always the commoner form.

⁴ 'I should be glad if you would bestow some Advice upon several young Readers in our Churches, who coming from the University, full fraught with Admiration of our Town Politeness, will needs correct the style of their Prayer Books . . . they are very careful to say *Pardons* and *Absolutes*; and in the Prayer for the Royal Family it must be endue 'um, enrich 'um, prosper 'um and bring 'um.'

cannot put the Word *Thing* after 'em p. 65, 93; that contains 'em 80; before 'em 81; between 'em 115', etc.

Vulg. corr. (p. 26): gives the following statement regarding 'em. 'Another vulgar contraction (which was, however, *considered elegant about fifty years ago*)¹ is the leaving out of the *th* in the word *them*. In conversation this contraction is still very common, but ought to be avoided by correct speakers whom we never hear saying 'I got 'em from the country'; etc. In all these cases, and wherever this vulgar 'em occurs, *them* should always be substituted. To those who have got into the habit of using the contraction this will at first be difficult, but a little attention will easily conquer it. *T'other for the other* is a vulgar contraction of the same kind'.

I laid 'em up 69.29; surrounded with 'em 355.36; I shar'd the Island with 'em 363.21.²

Otherwise always *them*., e. g.: 7.8; 12.4, etc.

¹ The italics are mine.

² PY who had not sent 'em anything 168.

CG 1: call 'em 7; bring 'em away 39; 'twas time to part 'em, reconcile 'em 51; 57; give 'em up 71; makes 'em wicked 87; left 'em 89; they have been like 'em 90.

11: it makes 'em talk 202; keep 'em company 273; Ay ay, that makes 'em have so little manners 50; joyn with 'em 57; I say to 'em 136; have care of 'em 273.

Ta. (very frequently) lay before 'em, an Observer af 'em, two of 'em 1.4.2; 1 designed to carry 'em, name 'em 86.4, etc. etc.; those who pretend to 'em 1.40.2; stand by 'em 212.2, etc. etc.

In **Sp.** the form seems to be not so usual in the text as in **Ta**; e. g.: — at the end of 'em 59.4; look in 'em 60.6, etc. — But in the various indexes of each volume, which were no doubt written by others than the authors of the papers, I think one might count hundreds of them e. g.: — the Reflection of 'em; the Grievance of 'em (vol. VI), etc. etc.

Last line of *The Campaign* 1705: And those who paint 'em truest praise 'em most.

Pope. *Eloisa to Abelard* I. 366: He best can paint 'em who shall feel 'em most; *Essay on Man* I. 303: does 'em good.

Ev. I'll give 'em leave I.160 (Br.); what should ail 'em III.2.42 (c); half of 'em I.188 (c); I'll never believe 'em II.151 (D), etc.

When an author in PE makes one of his characters use the form *'em*, he wants thereby to stamp him as an illiterate or vulgar person. This use of *'em* occurs already in Ev.: *them* is there the only form used by the educated characters, *'em* exclusively in the speech of vulgar persons.

B. Indefinite Pronouns.

I. T'other, the t'other.

The form *t'other* (*the t'other*) which nowadays only survives chiefly in vulgar language,¹ seems in Defoe's day to have been quite as correct as the *the other*. Many facts go to prove this. — In the grammars of LEDIARD and ARNOLD we find the following ex., probably made by the grammarians themselves: 'he is as rich as *t'other*' LED. 553; 'on *t'other* Side (of) the water' ARNOLD p. 119; and PEGGE (p. 73 in a note on the use of '*the t'other for the other*') states that *'this, that* and *t'other* or *the other* are allowable; but *the t'other* is a redundancy, and in fact is *the th'other*'. — See further the quotation from Vulg. Corr. p. 56.

But the best proof of its being considered quite literary is the fact that SWIFT in his letters very frequently uses the form. This is the more noteworthy as he otherwise always strongly objects to all sorts of 'Abbreviations and Elisions'.

To judge from Ev. the form seems to have been losing its former respectability already in the latter part of the cent., the author only making vulgar or very careless people use it in their speech. — Examples:

Reason expostulated with me *t'other* way 72.31; first on one Side then on *t'other* 242.26; he hollow'd as loud as *t'other* 347.8; *T'other* answer'd 317.12; Be that one way or *th'other* (B *t'other*) 111.14.²

¹ FR. DIAL. 229; STORM 779.

² CS than *t'other* 41; — TT *the t'other Scouts* 271.

Sw. Let. *t'other* day 12, 32, 37, 49; to one and then to *t'other* 29.

In all other cases the PE form *the other* is used, e. g.:

one of them (Men) lying on Shore, *the other* being in the Boat 314.23; one of them (Wolves) fastned upon his Horse, and *the other* attack'd the Man 347.2; *The other* Prisoners 310.11, etc.

2. Plural form *other* instead of PE *others*.

The plural form *other* (now archaic) which was rather common during the 16th and 17th cent.¹ besides the regular modern form *others*, is still greatly in favour with Defoe.

With the exception of a couple of instances — *the Cave where the others (Prisoners) lay* 319.24 (cf. l. 30); *the others (Men) who* 354.35 — the form *other* is, as far as I can see, the only one used in RC after the definite article, e. g.:

I had loaded my Gun and bad Xury load both the *other* 34.8. I found in one of them a He—Goat, and in one of the *other*, three Kids 172.4; (I saw eleven Savages) . . . seeing him alone, and not perceiving that the *other* sought him I show'd my self to him. 235.20; Two of them could Swim, but the Third cou'd not . . . he look'd at the *other*, but went no further 239.37; he told me, he thought it would be more advisable, to let him and the two *other*, dig and cultivate some more Land 291.35; they row'd up to the same Place, where the *other* (they were in all eleven Men) had landed, and where the Boat lay 308.25; I was unwilling to hazard the killing any of our own Men, knowing the *other* were very well armed 316.6; The *other* I order'd to my Bower, and as it was fenc'd in, and they pinion'd . . . 319.30.

Ta. her Mistress who gave *t'other* Guinea (five lines below) and gave him *t'other* half Guinea 14.5; *t'other* Day 25.7; he gives her another on *t'other* Side 36.3; this and *t'other* Worthy 83.2. — **Sp.** *t'other* Night 329.1.

In the text of MAITTAIRE: He is more of a man than *t'other* 47.

Ev. They won't go one way nor *t'other* II.21 (D); *T'other* day I.192 (c); *t'other* half I.188 (c); *t'other* night I.188 (c); *t'other* night II.82 (Miss P).

¹ See SPIES p. 38; FR. SYNT. p. 397, also on *t'other*. — For PE use see esp. NED.

Otherwise always *others*:

whatever we give *others* (Men) 152.24; some Skins were dry . . . but *others* 159.10; three *others* (Savages) 238.35; several *others* (Guns) 220.3, etc.

In other writings of Defoe the PE form seems to be the predominant one.¹ — I regret I cannot give many instances of the plural form *other* from other 18th century works, which in no small degree ought to be ascribed to the fact that it is so very easy to overlook this phenomenon.

¹ PY John and his Comrades went towards Waltham; the *other* in two Companies, went towards Epping 161; others were instantly employed to fill their Places, till it was known whether the *other* should live or die 213.

CG These are the patterns for the *other* to be sham'd by . . . these are the standards who shew should striv to imitate 90; These are to pipe and the *other* to dance 99; I'll lay out the money in books that I intended to lay out in pictures; for i can't be cheated so much in the books as I have been in the *other* 137; let the elder brothers have the same share of witt as the *other* (the younger brothers) have to raise estates by 174; Our phylosophers have exploded the Ancients in many things, such as . . . likewise . . . abundance of modern experiments not to be nam'd with the *other*; likewise the improvmnts in the mathe-maticks . . . incampments . . . in all which and many *other* the know-lege is beyond what ever went before them 231.

Ta. several Characters . . . a very pretty Fellow . . . a Person exalted above the *other* . . . one who outstrips his Companions 24.1.

VI. Verbs.

A. Simple Tenses.

i. Present Tense.

1.

The ending of the first person singular.

With the exception of such expressions as *I says, says I* (cf. *says he, says she*) which are very frequent, esp. in the works of Defoe,¹ instances of the PE use of adopting the 3rd sing. (possibly the ME North of England plural) ending *s* for all persons in the present indicative — now chiefly occurring in dialectal and vulgar language² — are very scarce in literary 18th century English, e.g.:

No *says I* 27.27; hold *says I* 249.37; Well, *says I* 326.16, etc. etc.; *I fetches* my two Guns 240.11; *I takes* my Man *Friday* with me 245.16.³

¹ Cf. Introduction p. 10.

² See ESt. 12.221; STORM pp. 804, 828, 949; WRIGHT p. 296.

³ **Ta.** Nay, *says I* 25.11; Prithee Jack, *says I* 206.2; Methinks, *says I* (*says he*, two lines below) 275.2.

Sp. Mary, *says I*, if it be so 60.9.

Ev. *I gives* II.83 (Br.); *I puts* II.82 (Br.); So *I says, says I*, my Lord, *says I* II.224 (Br.); but then, *thinks I* I.156 (Br.); to be sure *thinks I*, she'll stay II.69 (Miss Br.); for *I sees* I.125, II.149 (D); *I wants* to speak to him II.216 (D).

If I understand STORM (p. 804, note 1) rightly, he seems to assert that in Ev. *thinks I* was used in quite correct speech. This is however a mistake. The examples quoted by him are to be found here above: I.156, II.69.

Even if such phrases as *says I*, etc. in the beginning of the 18th century were considered as quite correct (see Storm p. 804), I think one can conclude from the instances in Ev., that already in the latter part of the century they were considered as no longer proper even in the spoken language of educated people; cf. note p. 60.

The ending of the 3rd person singular.

But for a single example in the introduction of CG page 4: 'a man that *hath* the naturall beauties of his mind' . . . and some intentionally archaic forms as *doth remove* 49; *hath been* 52; *falleth*, *sendeth* 60, etc. found in PY, the ending *th* does not occur in the original¹ editions of Defoe's works examined by me. — In B, however, *hath plac'd* 230.17 is put in instead of *has plac'd* in A, which change ought probably to be attributed to the printer.

In contemporary prose works, on the other hand, the case is quite different. Though in Ta. and Sp. *hath* and *doth* are not so very uncommon, the ending (*e*)*th* does not occur in other verbs but for giving a specially oldfashioned touch to the language. — In the works of SWIFT, on the other hand, the (*e*)*th*-forms are very common; as to *hath*, at least, this form is certainly even more common than *has*.²

¹ The form *hath* (*God hath yet Mercy in Store*) occurring on page 156.1 in the so-called facsimile must be due to a 'misprint', A having *had*.

² **TT** *hath been* 58; *hath procured* 77; *hath saved* 121; *has found* (two lines below) *hath pass'd* 290, etc. etc. — Whoever *hath* an Ambition 33; The Disposition *hath* not the least Use 306. — The Man *doth* never stop 154, etc. — the Brain *disposeth* its Owner to . . . 170; Learning *puffeth* Men up 149; a greater Coward *burdeneth* not the Army . . . *perverteth* (in an attack on a 'Miscreant Prater') 270.

In **Sw. Let.** *hath* is likewise much commoner than *has*, as for instance *hath heen written* 25; *hath lyen* 57; *a man who hath planting going on* 45, etc. — *has writt* 11. — Only *does*, *goes*, *passes*, etc.

In the same way as SWIFT (Ta. 230; cf. note 4, p. 54), ADDISON and STEELE are very conservative in their utterances as to the ending *th*. In Sp. 135, which is wholly devoted to linguistic matters, ADDISON deeply regrets that the substitution of an *s* for 'the Pronunciation of our Forefathers' as '*drovnceth, walketh, arrivceth*' has 'added to the *kissing* in our Language which is taken so much notice of by Foreigners', and STEELE ('on the well reading of Prayers', Sp. 147) expresses his indignation with 'a Sett of Readers, who affect, forsooth, a certain Gentleman-like Familiarity of Tone crying instead of Pardoneth and Absolveth, Pardons and Absolves'.

When comparing PE usage with that of the early 18th century it is interesting to see that POPE neither in his prose nor his poetry employs the ending *th*. The present poetical use thereof came into prominence only towards the end of the century; cf. JESP. STR. p. 195. In ordinary prose style the *th*-forms do not seem to occur in the latter part of the century.

*

In the Introduction to the *original* edition 1738 of *Polite Conversation*, where SWIFT affects a quasi scientific tone, *hath* is, as far as I can see, the only occurring form, e. g. pp. 3, 15, 25, 26, etc.; *doth*, however, is used alternately with *does*, e. g. *doth not require 15; does too much Honour 82*, etc. With other verbs no *th*-forms are found.

In the conversations themselves, on the other hand, *has*, *does*, *passes*, etc. are the forms constantly used. — Cf. JESPERSEN'S not quite correct statements in JESP. STR. (p. 194, 195) where also information as to the use of *th* in other 17th and 18th cent. works can be obtained.

Ta. *hath* taken 158.2; every Verse *hath* something 163.7, etc.; a Catalogue that *doth not come* 158.1; — *hath* avoided, *doth poll*, etc. (arch. style) 73.16.

Sp. *hath* been 70.5; *hath* filled 40.4; *hath* struck 72.11, etc.; a Multitude which *hath not* in it . . . 70.1; one that *hath not* a Tendency to . . . 542.4 = 529.1; wit *doth not consist* in . . . 253.6; — he *hath* born me (arch. style) 468.2; — *containeth, expresteth, savoureth, soundeth* only in intentionally archaic style as used by 'Ephraim the Quaker' 133.

The unsettled state concerning the use of the ending *s* and *th* is clearly shown by the statements of the grammarians of the time.¹

LEDIARD declares that besides '(e)th: *deniceth*' the 3rd sing. has 'noch eine andere Endung, welche heutiges Tages (absonderlich im geschwinden Reden) am meisten gebraucht wird: *fears, loves, denies, has, etc.*'.

According to GREENWOOD 'the *S* instead of the ending *Eth* is now most commonly used, but this change is very blameable, unless it may be allowable in *Poetry*'. And in order further to support his statement he copies Addison's words in Sp. 135. — Greenwood is probably the first grammarian who has at least some vague idea that this *s* is not merely a 'blameable' innovation. This appears from a note referring to 'blameable', in which he states that 'the changing of *eth* or *ath* into *as, es, is* is of pretty long standing, introduced by the Danes' . . .

Other grammarians as, e. g. MIÈGE (p. 25) and MAITTAIRE (p. 62), express as their opinion that *s* is only a shortening or contraction of *th*.

S. JOHNSON mentions the forms side by side with each other: '*loveth* or *loves*'; '*hath* or *has*', which he says 'is a termination corrupted from *hath*, but now more frequently used both in verse and prose'. — The following quotation from WARD (p. 422) will show that about the middle of the 18th century the present feeling of archaism as to the use of the *th* was already noticeable: 'The third person singular of the simple present tense was anciently formed from the first, by subjoining the syllable *eth*; as from *call, calleth*; [*has + hath*] p. 393] but this form is now disused, except in the solemn stile of the Scripture'.

¹ In the text of their works LEDIARD, Dr. JOHNSON and WARD seem only to use the *s*-forms. So does JONES as a rule, *th* being found only once: *as followeth* p. 13. — MAITTAIRE uses the forms quite promiscuously, e. g. *beloveth, pleaseth* 157; *repenteth* 157, next line *repents*; *riseth*, in the *Preface*, next line *reaps*, etc.

By quotations from 17th century grammars Jespersen (p. 194) shows that already at that period 'it was usual to read *s* where the book had *th*'. According to his opinion *hath* and *doth* would be exceptions to this rule. — It is quite possible that at the beginning of the 18th century *hath* and *doth* are not merely to be considered as orthographical variants of *has*, *does*: on the other hand, it does not seem to me very probable that in ordinary style they were 'prevalent till about the middle of the eighteenth century'; (cf. Jones p. 107).

2.

The use of *ha'* in Defoe is quite remarkable. While in all the contemporary works I have examined scarcely a single instance of *ha'* alone occurs, this form is very frequent in all the works of Defoe, even his MSS.¹ — Bülbring (CG p. XVII) seems merely to consider the form as a specimen of Defoe's fancy for abbreviations, placing it side by side with such shortenings as *acc^t*, *hon^{bl}* for *account*, *honourable*.

¹ PY would *ha'* been, would *ha'* sunk 113; might *ha'* travelled 141, etc. etc.

In a passage in Sp. 274 'which is *verbatim* the Copy of a Letter written by a Bawd' we find the form still further reduced to *a*: 'expecting to *a* found . . . as to *a* set her up'.

*

CG I write no stile, I *han't* words 132.

The following words put into the mouth of 'a man of letters' shows that Defoe considered the contracted form *han't* (and *an't*) quite correct: *Han't* you a vast estate? *An't* you rich? 129.

By Defoe's contemporaries, however, *han't* is only used to denote vulgar or very careless speech, e. g.:

Sp. You *ha'n't* that Simper for nothing, says the Gipsie 130.1.

PC I *ha'n't* eaten it 447; you *ha'n't* tasted it 443, etc.

Ev. (only as a vulgarism): You *ha'n't* no eyes I.78 (D); *ha'n't* we a right to know that much I.95 (c); you *ha'n't* been o'top of the Monument II.106 (Br.). — Cf. *ha'n't* she, Miss II.214 (Br.).

For PE usage see esp. SWEETS *Elementarbuch* p. 21 and NED.

etc., which abbreviations he says he 'has always expanded'. In my opinion this must be due to a mistake: *ha'* was no doubt used by Defoe as a separate form of pronunciation by the side of the full *have*; cf. *Archiv* 110, p. 202 ff.

In its use as an auxiliary this form occurs no less than fifteen times; in three of these cases (pp. 25.20, 32.33, 50.5) *ha'* has been replaced by *have* in B. As a principal verb *ha'* is met with only once. For instance:

I could *ha'* been content to *ha'* taken and *ha'* drown'd
the Boy 25.20. I was inclin'd to *ha'* gone on Shoar 32.34;
I might *ha'* staid 40.1; I could scarce *ha'* fail'd 45.14: —
Lord *ha'* Mercy upon me 94.21.

Note. It is well worth noting that *ha'* only occurs in the first six printed sheets of RC. The explanation of this is no doubt to be sought in the fact that the compositors or even possibly the proof-readers of these sheets have on the whole 'followed copy'; in the other sheets, however, the full form *have* was inserted instead. — In other works of Defoe *ha'* occurs fairly evenly distributed all over the works.

*

As is well known SWIFT was a sworn enemy to all sorts of abbreviations and contractions. In a letter to Th. Beach, 12 April 1735, we find his view of the matter unmistakably expressed: . . . 'for *han't* read *want*. I abhor those *han't*'s and *won't*'s, etc. etc., they are detestable in verse as well as in prose'; cf. *won't*, etc. p. 26. — ARNOLD p. 73 states that *a* is used instead of *ha'* or *have* ('he would *a* fled') 'iedoch nicht zum besten, und mehr in geschwinder Rede, als im Schreiben'. — Other grammarians are quite silent on this point.

2. Past Tenses.

Strong verbs.¹

Preterite.

α. Preterite forms, dating back to a pret. used in an earlier period of the language, but which no longer exists in standard PE, of get, speak, strike.

Got, *speak* and *struck* are by far the commonest; *gat*, *spake* and *strook* being only met with some few times in the instances quoted below:

we *got* 13.24; he *spoke* 27.6; she *struck* 73.6 etc., etc.
I cou'd not bear to stay; so I *gat* me up the Hill 195.18;
As soon as I *gat* thither 217.2; they launch'd their Boat and
gat them on board 311.13; when I *spake* 249.18; If they
met... or *spake* (B *spoke*) 257.31; I began to return; I
strook forward 51.35 — [Only *broke* 5.17; *swore* 25.29; *wore*
5.23, etc.].²

To judge from the very few instances met with in the prose writings of those days I think forms like *gat*, *spake*, *strook* must already in the beginning of the 18th century

¹ As regards the grouping of the preterites and pa. pples. of these verbs it has been very difficult to find a satisfactory system of classification. On account of the slight material at my disposal I did, however, not consider it necessary to group them in any other way than the one adopted.

² **PY** As it had gotten some Vent into the Discourse, the Secretaries *gat* Knowledge of it 2; they heard Voices that never *spake* and Sights that never appear'd 27.

CG His father *gat* no amends 259.

TT who *begat* (5 times, in arch. style) 76. — Otherwise always *begot*.

have been considered somewhat archaic, (see Brightland below). The forms given in the grammars no doubt depend upon their being taken either from the Bible, or Shakespeare, or high flown and poetical language from the middle and latter part of the 17th century.¹

WALLIS says (p. 97) that besides the usual form *broke*, *spoke*, etc., 'quaedam etiam formantur per a ut *brake*, *spake*, *bare*, *share*, *sware*, *tare*, *ware*, *clave*, *gat*, *begat*, *forgat* et fortasse etiam alia sed rarius', which statement BRIGHTLAND, as usual, entirely follows, but adds at the same time that 'this way is seldom and very impolite'.

*

GREENWOOD and LEDIARD always indicate with a * or a + that forms like *brake*, *gat* (not even mentioned by GR.), *spake*, *sware*, *tare* are already out of common use; only once in the case of the pret. of *speak* Lediard places the *a* and *o* form on the same level: '*spoke*, *spake*'. [Strook I have not even found mentioned by the above grammarians].

S. JOHNSON'S statements in his grammar, being only copied from Wallis, cannot of course give us any guidance as to the use of these forms in the English language in the first part of the 18th cent., and far less in the middle of it. But even if we accepted his own words in his Dictionary, I think we should get a very erroneous conception of the real circumstances: with the exception of *shear*, *wear* (cf. my statements p. 91, 92) and *forget* all the rest enumerated in Wallis are here given with double forms, the *a* form however (resp. *strook*)² always ['*spake* or *spoke*' excepted] being placed second.

He certainly tells us that *drave* (not in Wallis) *gat*, *tare* were used '*anciently*'; but on examining the examples upon which he has no doubt based his statements, one very soon realizes that he ought to have put this word beside

¹ STORM p. 997; CRAIK pp. 257, 291, 295; FRANZ 9; VODOZ 56. — POPE *Essay on Man* III.171: the Voice *spake* (rhyming with *take*). DRYDEN *Palamon and Arcite* l. 245: so strong she *strook*... to fell an *Oak*.

² 'the preterite of strike used in poetry for *struck*'.

most of the forms, his examples being as a rule, either, and this for the greater part, taken from the Bible, where, as is well known, forms like *bare*, *gat* are far commoner than those like *bore*, *got*, or from Shakespeare, where they still occurred rather frequently.

This opinion is all the more plausible as even in the poets quoted, e. g. Dryden and Pope, the PE standard forms are as a rule the only ones occurring; and WARD (p. 416) puts a \dagger as a sign of obsolescence before: *brake*, *spake*, *bare*, *share*, *sware*, *tare*, *ware*, *clare*, *gat*, *dare*.

3. Preterite forms being historically due to the influence of either the original pret. sing. or the pret. plural (pa. pple.) form of begin, drink, spring, run; cling, fling, sing, sink, sling, wring; swim.

Began is beyond comparison the most common form (some forty instances) *begun* only being found eight times:

I *began* 54.8; the Wind *began* 49.10; the Stakes *began* 181.7; — I *begun* 104.34; My Life *begun* 157.27; 135.20, etc.

The preterite *run*, on the contrary, is much commoner (forty instances), while *ran* is only met with twenty-one times:

I *ran* 80.18; it *ran* 63.9; the Creature swam and *ran* . . . 34.34; — I *run* 34.7; he *run* 350.14; I found they *run* 32.36; My Thoughts *run* and I was 146.20.

The linguistic sense can certainly not have been very strongly developed as regards the different forms of these verbs, both forms being found almost in the same line, as:

Conscience *begun* to awake and I *began* to reproach my self 105.24.

In other instances again the two editions differ, e. g.:

The Bear *began* to totter, and *begun* (B *began*) to look 351.10; I *run* (B *ran*) and I *got* 93.23; a strong Eddy,

which *run* (B *ran*) 165.34: many were wounded; they *run* (B *ran*) 278.2.

Of *drink* and *spring* the examples are rather scarce, *drank* occurring three times, and *drunk* only once. *Sprang* and *sprung* occur only once each:

I neither eat or *drank* 101.32; 111.37; he *drank* and began to eat 284.12; — I *drunk* 110.35; It *sprang* 92.10; this *sprung* up 123.16.

The preterites of *cling*, *fling*, *sing*, *sink*, *sling*, *wring* only show the forms with *u*, while *swim* has only *a*:

this Thought *clung* to my Heart 223.34; I *flung* 34.26: he *danc'd*, *sung* . . . *wrung* 282.7,9; this *sunk* my Soul 94.13; He *sunk* down 34.10; I *slung* 34.26; He *swam* 25.4, etc.¹

¹ **CS** we *run* up the Hill and there we saw a Ship 44; we *run* for the Shore and *run* our Frigates into a Creek where we saw 50; they were . . . for they *run* up three or four Huts, 61, etc.

PY it *began* 21; I am supposing the Plague to be begun and that the Magistrates *begun* 42; 57; it *begun* (next line *I began*) 90; every Body *began* 35; 19, etc. (the usual form); they eat and *drank* 260; another *run* naked 26; as they had a Notion all their Predilections *run* upon a Plague 30; Scarce did they use . . . but *run* 106; 184; 186; 226, etc. (the same as in RC the common form); he *ran* 186; they *rung* 107; he daunted and *sung* 203; 204; they *sang* 286 (unusual); those Ministers *sunk* the Hearts 30; he *sunk*, his Head *sunk* 138; 140; 284; they *swam* 187.

CG the families *begun* 13; the discourse *begun* while they were at dinner 154; antient history when . . . other barbrous nations over-*run* Italy 22; He *run* 119; it *run* 192.

TT They writ and *sung* 56; the Walls *sunk* 243.

Ta. we *shrunk* 102.5; down we *spun* 132.10; They *sprung* a Mine 59.11.

Sp. I *began* 266.3; it *begun* 435.1; he *drunk* 266.2; the Bell *rung* 108.5; I *sprung* 266.3; birds *sung* 283.6; they *sunk* 159.6.

Ev. I *sunk* I.79; I almost instantly *sunk* II.97; he *sunk* III.255; she *sunk* II.23; I *sprung* III.80; the creature *sprung* III.254. — All these examples out of perfectly correct style. — she *run* I.111 (D).

If we now pass on to an examination of the statements of the grammars of that time we find no slight deviation from what are given as standard forms by modern grammarians. Cf. note 1, p. 71. — WALLIS (p. 95) gives decided preference to forms with *u* 'tam in Preterito Imperfecto quam in Participio Passivo: *wonne, spun begun swum struck stuck sung stung flung rung wrung sprung swung drunk sunk shrunk stunk hung come* [cf. p. 75] *run*. Sed et eorum pleraque formantur etiam in Preterito Imperfecto per *a*, ut *wan began sang rang sprang drank came ran*: et quædam alia, sed rarius'.

The *u* forms seem also to be greatly preferred by MAITTAIRE and LEDIARD, the former giving as a rule only *u* forms; *begun* or *began*, *sung* and *sang* being the only variants extant. The latter giving either one of these forms alone as *rung*, *slung*, *spun*, *stung*, *wrung* (= Gr.), or both, indicating by the order of words or a + that the *a* form is much less used: *drunk, drank; sung, + sang; sunk, + sank; sprung, + sprang; swum, swam* (Gr. *swum, *swam*).¹ *won, + wan* (= Gr.); *swung, + swang* (= Gr.).

GREENWOOD, however, seems in this respect to hold an opinion, very often differing both from preceding and succeeding grammarians. Quite contrary to Lediard he gives the following preterites: *rang* (only); *drank* or **drunk*:¹ *sang* and **sung*; *sank* or **sunk*; *sprang* or *sprung*.

As will clearly be seen from these extracts from the grammars of the latter part of the 17th century up to the three first decades of the 18th, the *u* forms were then considered beyond comparison the most common. To show that this is still the century, case throughout the century, I shall here give statements of three grammatical authors: Samuel Johnson and Ward, in the middle, and Pegge, at the end of the century.

In his grammar S. JOHNSON'S statements are exactly the same as Brightland's, both, in this case, as in many others,

¹ The star before a certain form indicates, as Gr. states in a note, that this form is 'not proper or usual'.

being merely translated from Wallis without any statement of the source.

In his Dictionary, however, which no doubt may be considered to express his own opinions more or less influenced by the common usage of his time, he gives the preterite forms of the subsequent verbs as follows:

1. *only u*: *fling, hang (hanged, anciently hong) ring, sink (anciently sank), sling, slink.*
2. *u or a*: *shrink, spin, spring (anciently spong), sting, stink.*
3. *a or u*: *begin, drink, sing, swim (swam, swom, or sunum), swing, win (wan and won).*
4. *only a*: *ran.*

WARD (p. 413) considers the *a* forms of verbs in *ing* as *eling, ring*, etc. to be obsolete; the same is the case with *began, span: drank, sank, slank, shrank, stank; swam, wan.* Of *run*, however, he only gives the preterite form *ran*.

PEGGE (p. 324) laments that by modern affectation the language is rendered 'much more clouded and less intelligible upon the first glance or coup d'oeil, than it was anciently. *Begin* has taken the place of *Began* in the preterit, *Run* of *Ran*; *Drunk* of *Drank*; *Sprung* of *sprang*, etc.' — As it appears from this quotation, Pegge's opinions in this matter do not seem to have been shared by his own contemporaries; most of our modern writers and grammarians, however, quite evidently consider as standard forms those vindicated by him.¹

¹ Those who want to have a comprehensive view of the fairly divided opinions of our modern grammarians concerning the current and correct pret. forms of verbs belonging to this category I refer to a paper (29 pages) in *Anglia* 17, p. 486 ff. by Dr. SWAEN, where he quotes and criticizes the opinions given by them. Finally he states the results he has arrived at himself by means of his own investigations. A great collection of instances from authors of the 17th and 18th century are also to be found in the paper. See further KRÜGER II.161, III.410.

7. Preterite forms, due to the influence of analogy with the pa. pple. form, of *bid* (*forbid*), *come* (*become*),
give, *ride*, *rise* (*arise*), see.¹

With the exception of the pret. forms of *bid* and *ride* (see below) the forms *came*, *gave*, (*a*)*rose*, *saw*, current in present standard English, are incomparably the most frequent:

I run over . . . since I *came* 232.8; we *saw* no more Wolwes, 'till we *came* and entred the Plain 354.8; I *gave*

¹ **CS** he *come* running 98; we *rid* 13; the ship *rid* 19.

MF she *bid* me 5, 8; she *bid* her Maid go up 39; (she *bad* me 61);

PY he *bid* her stay 185, 126; they *forbad* 253; I *bad* him go lay them 127, 85, 86; It matter'd not from whence it *come* 1; The Ships *rid* 128; they *rid* at their Roads 133; the Aldermen *rid* 181; the Infection spread in a dreadful Manner, and the Bills *rise* high 8; as they saw the consequence they soon *see* the Danger they were in so they resolv'd to divide themselves again 160; she was terribly frighted and she run . . . When she *see* he would . . . she turn'd 184; this was a most afflicting thing to me, who *see* it all from my own windows 197. — [*Saw* 28, 29 is, however, the same as in RC the usual form.]

CG if you were never taught, how *come* you to understand Latin 188; In a word his pupils *came* . . . and severall of them *come* afterward to speak in all those places 219.

TT They *Writ* and Sung 56; he *writ* 185.

Sw. Let. Your Letter *come* this moment 39; I *writ* 53.

Sp. he *bid* him stop 329.3; the Captain *bid* Sir Roger fear nothing 335.2; 130.5; 283.4, 7; 329.3; 380.5, etc.; I *rid* well . . . (four lines below) . . . as I *rode* (Steele) 113.3; a Couple who *rid* 122.2; two Fellows who *rid* 152.3; the Author *writ* 40.4; who *writ* 23.2; 105.3; they *writ* 253.7; 343.2 (2 ex.); 454.7.

In **Ev.** only used as a vulgarism in the speech of D, e. g.: in all my travels, I never *see* nothing eleganter I.128; I'm sure, I had n't given him no offence, as I know of, for I never *see* his face all the time II.43; you are the impudentest fellow ever I *see* II.31; you're the most rudest boy ever I *see* II.169, etc.

over the Hopes of the Boat 148.9; 263.25; he sunk but *rose* instantly 34.11; there *arose* . . . Fowls 61.16; we spy'd the Bear come . . . the biggest that ever I *saw* 349.13, etc. etc.

The preterite form *bid*, which now like the pa. pple. *bid*, generally only occurs in the sense of *bid at an auction* (see NED) is almost as common as *bad* (always spelt thus in A), 12 *bid* being found to 16 *bad*. As far as I can see from the investigations made, the sense of the different forms is quite the same (cf. Krüger II.161) *told*, *ordered* being in both predominant:

I call'd to Friday and *bid* him go 273.3, 347.6 (9 ex. = told); he (my father) *bid* me observe it 3.21; our Guide *bid* us be easy 346.26, 354.4 (3 ex. = asked); their Fate *forbid* it 223.13; — I *bad* him (the boy) lye still 31.1; 34.7; his Ankles were so swell'd, so I *bad* him sit still 284.21, etc.

He added, they learn'd much of the Bearded-Mans that *come* in the Boat 266.28; The Tide was turn'd and the Flood *come* on 225.8; I ask'd him then what *become* of them 264.18.

In the last two instances B has altered the form *come* into *came*, while, on the contrary, in the following examples A has the PE form *came*:

... *came* . . . if your Nation beat them, how *come* you to be taken 253.30; He got . . . then he *come* down the Tree 352.21.

The same is the case with *give*:

This appear'd so clear . . . and I *give* (A *gave*) most humble thanks to God, who had 205.1.

The preterite forms *rid* and *rode* occur respectively 4 and 6 times:

Our Ship *rid* 10.24; Two Ships that *rid* 11.15; a Ship which *rid* 11.17; We mended our Pace and *rid* up

348.4: — our ship *rid* (10.24) . . . we *rode* 10.28; I bid him ride up . . . he *rode* 347.9; we *rod* nearer 351.1; [cf. CG he *rod* 251: they *wrot* 209, etc].

He *rise* and call'd 25.3: I had not a Word to say but *rise* up (B *rose*) 109.6.

He *see* 'me cock, and present, he did the same . . . 277.32; I thought he had kill'd them all; for I *see* them all fall of a Heap into the Boat; though I *saw* . . . 278.26 (Cf. *began-begun* p. 68). I gave them Provisions . . . and wishing them a good voyage I *see* them go 295.5; When the Bear *see* his Enemy gone he comes 352.16.¹

[Of *drive*, *write* only the PE standard forms occur:

three *drove* and came 11.22; I *wrote* 341.34, etc].

*

Similar preterite forms were no doubt not so very usual either in the 17th or the 18th century. That they occur in literature at all, though rather seldom with the exception of *bid*, *rid* and *writ*, is shown by instances quoted by Franz p. 10; Vodoz p. 56; Storm pp. 753, 781, 810 and 948, and by my own examples.

From this, I think, it will appear that such forms as *come*, *see* particularly, must have been in especial favour with Defoe, these not having been found in any of the other works I have, though not so minutely, gone through. The others seem to be considered quite standard forms by his greatest contemporary stylists.²

*

I now proceed to give the statements and views concerning these verb forms as expressed in the grammars examined by me. — In WALLIS p. 97 the pret. forms of *give*, *bid*, *sit* are said to be *gave*, *bad*, *sate*; pa. pple. *'given*, *bidden*, *sitten*'. Sed utrobique *bidd sit'*. Moreover he states that besides the

¹ For the readings of the mod. reprints see p. XXVI ff.

² Concerning their present use especially in the dialects of southern England and in the vulgar lang. see esp. STORM 781; FRANZ 10; FR. DIAL. 219; WRIGHT 281 ff.

forms with *o* as *thowr*, etc. 'utrobique dicimus etiam *thrive*, *rise*,¹ *smitt*, *writ*, *abidd*. *ridd*, [for *come* see pp. 70], which statement, as is always the case, is copied by Brightland and Johnson. — In JDict. the following are the only forms given side by side with the PE standard preterites: *bid*; *rid*; 'rise, pret. *rose*; part. *risen*. Cowley has *riss*, for *rose*; so has Jonson'; *writ*. — Except the double pret. forms '*rid* or *rode*'; '*writ* and *wrote*' (*wrote-writ* Led.) the pret. forms given in GREENWOOD entirely agree with the PE standard use. Besides the above mentioned double forms LEDIARD also gives the preterites: *rise* and *rose* (pple. *risen* as Gr.); *throve*, + *thrive* (Gr. *throve*, + *thrived*).²

Past participle.

a. Past participles, due to the analogy with the pret. sing. form, of begin, drink; shake take.³

Begin is practically the only past participle, *began* being met with in one solitary instance. *Drank*, on the other hand,

¹ The occurrence of *rise* is also stated in MIEGE p. 14: 'rise pour *rose* au prétérit où l'i a le son Français'.

² Cf. p. 90 ff.

³ PY *Begin*, *shaken*, *taken* are the only pa. pple. forms found.

While Defoe in RC only uses the pa. pple. form *struck* (cf. *strook* in CG) *struck* and *stricken* occur here alternately with each other, e. g. — those were *struck* with Death 97; ... *struck* with the Distemper 193; 80; 221; People had been *stricken* with the Infection 88; if the Blow is insensibly *stricken* 233.

CG he is but a mongrell *begat* by a gentleman 79; have *mistook* 165; the impression was *strook* at a heat 193; I would have *took* him 165; having *wrote* 88; friends are *wrote* to 132.

TT had *arose* 211; 237; [cf. hath *arisen* 290; be *arisen* 251]; hath *blew* up 146; have *mistook* 176; be *shook* 183; has *wrote* 9 = Sw. Prop. 146.

Ta. is *drank* 24.12; to be *drank* 62.12; had *ran* 102,6; have *wrote* 24.19.

probably to avoid the inebriate associations with *drunk*, which is only once used as a genuine adjective in the sense of 'intoxicated', is the only form occurring, e. g.:

I had *begun* 45.10; My Hedge was *begun* 173.29; I should have *began* 150.16; — When he had *drank* it 273.35; having *drank* a little too much I... 299.35; I was made *drunk* 9.10.

Shook and *shaken* are found only once each; *took* is very rarely met with (only twice), while there are some 60 instances of *taken*, 30 with the auxiliary *be*, and 28 with *have*, this form also being the only one used in compounds (8 times).

I had *shook* 91.34; if it should be *shaken* 95.35: had the Powder *took* fire 70.14; Friday would fain have had me *took* one of their Canoes 281.11; the third had *taken* water 58.20; it would be his Fate to be *taken* 20.34, 36; was *mistaken* 88.16; was *overtaken* 7.20; had *overtaken* 20.26: was *undertaken* 198.33, etc.

3. Past participles, with or without the original pa.
pple. ending -en, of *bid*, *bite*, *break*, *(for)get*, *(hide)*
ride *write*.¹

Friday kept his Eyes upon me that as I had *bid* him he might observe... 277.28; the Creature had *bit* him 347.34; (having the Events *hid* from his Eyes 232.31).

Sp. have *drank* 72.7; 167.3; [had *forsook* < The Freeholder 22.2]; he has *rose* 44.1; it has *rose* 61.5; had *took* 44.5.

In the text of 'Obserrations' *wrote* seems to be the only occurring pa. pple. form, e. g. *be wrote* [4 lines below] *we wrote* p. 9.

Ev. he should 'nt have *fell* I. 122 (D); is he *rode* out this morning III. 16 (Ly. L); having *rode* II. 20; Printed as *wrote* by the authors [in a list of books 'just published'] I. 236.

¹ For the arrangement of these verbs see note 1, p. 66.

CS I had *eat* it 5; had *forgot* 15; having *gotten* 6; *be gotten* 53; 69: were *gotten* 23; 35.

In connection with the auxiliary *have* the proportion between *broke* and *broken* is as 5 to 2, e. g.:

MF he had *bil* 23; has *forbid* 49; he had *spoke* 23; I would have *spoke* 38.

PY they have *broke* in and murther'd... 98; the Swelling is *broke* 126; 284; The Lock was *broke* 104; Men who were *broke* out 160; 34; 231; the Man with his Fleart *broke* 138. [*Broken* is, however, the usual form, e. g.] had *broken* 84; 85; 114; 202; 266, etc.; was *broken* 34; 43; 60; 235; they have *forbid* 84; were *forbid* 35; be *forgot* (always) 22, 245, etc.; has *got* 137; 166; 185; be *got* 47; 143; 280; hast thou *gotten* 125; 76; 221; they have *gotten* into Barns 65; 76; 125; it was *gotten* into several Streets 7; (kept *hid* 66); has *spoke* 112; 261; to be *spoke* with 37; to be *spoken* of 40. — Only *bitten*, *written*: — have *bitten* 186; have *written* 200; were *written* 270.

CG have *forgot* 51; is *forgot* 157; 253; be *forgotten* 133; 157; has *gott* 142; having *gotten* 265; (is *hidden* 74); is *written* 65 [never *writ*].

TT I have *broke* my Leg 200; have *chose* 25; have *forgot* 72 (5 ex.); be *forgot* 43 (3 ex); being *forgotten* 250. (Only *got*): have *got* 18 (5 ex.); be *got* 128 (3 ex.); (be *hid* 148; 250; what *hidden* Spring 162); have *slid* 214; have *spoke* 107; 259; 269; be *spoke* 17; have *stole* 187; have *tore* 248; be *trod* 214; 267; has *writ* 23; 218; was *writ* 7; 65; 66; hath been *writ* 65; Treatises *writ* by... [facing the title page]; they were *writ* (four lines below) they were *written* [the Bookseller to the Reader]; has *written* 10; 62; be *written* 50; 69.

With regard to Swift's use of the language — esp. in TT — it is well worth noting that these shortened pa. pple. forms are not only considerably more numerous than similar forms in RC, although TT is a volume of much less bulk than RC, but they are moreover proportionately much more common than the PE full forms, e. g.: — these *broken* Ends 62; a *drunken* Beau 133; had *taken* 25; be *taken* 140; was *mistaken* 165; 290; be *undertaken* 116.

Sw. Let. have *forbidden* 13; have *bespoke* 24; have *forgot* 13; 16; 36; be *forgotten* 42; — (Always) *got* 1; 2, etc; had *writt* 13; 15; 23; 41, etc; was *writ* 23; 40; 51; been *writt* 49; Pamphlets *writt* so well 23; 40; — hath been *written* 24 (fairly rare).

Ta. a Silence was *broke* 86.3; two Letters, one *broke* open 275.2; had *spoke* 53.3; has *writ* 21.1; 40.2; 145.4; who had *writ* [2 lines above *I writ them*] 91.10; have been *writ* 275.2; one Simile *writ* 158.2.

which would have *broke* my Heart 59.11; the Wreck had *broke* itself 99.7; we had *broke* a Hole 308.7; the Ship had *broke* 12.37; Bears had *broke* into the Village 358.30; Chests, which I had *broken* open 57.16; the Juice having *broken* them 118.2.

Together with the auxiliary *be*, however, *broken* is much commoner, 8 *broken* to only 2 *broke*. In a purely adjectival sense *broken* is solely used (8 ex.):

She was *broken* 49.28; I found them *broken* 171.24; the Stern was *broke* 97.30; finding his Leg *broke* 31.11; three *broken* Oars 58.31.

Used as a tr. verb with the auxiliary *have* the forms *got* and *gotten* are almost equally common, 9 *got* and 10 *gotten*:

I had *got* a Victory 9.27; 154.8, 10, etc. I resolv'd to harbour what I had *gotten* in my Cave 227.33: I had *gotten* two pair of Shoes 228.36.

In an intransitive sense the proportion is as 5 to 2:

We had *got* on Shore 55.23; I had *got* to the Top 55.13; 60.36; Had I not *gotten* upon this Hill 163.16. Having *gotten* over these things 80.34.¹

Sp. had he *broke* Windows 105.1; he had his Head *broke* 57.4; 481.3; he had *drew* it 108.5; I had *eat* 344.1; I have *forbid* 311.1; we had *rid* 116.6; I have *spoke* 36.3; 118.2; I have *writ* 344.2. [The *Spectator* of 1712 used by EARLE (o. c. p. 268) reads here *have wrote*.] — (*Hidden*) and *written* are the usual forms both in Ta. and Sp., e. g. Ta. 100.5; Sp. 61.5; 158.4, etc.

In the text of WARD *spoke* and *spoken* are used quite promiscuously: to be *spoke* 59; the person *spoke* of 75; words are *spoke* (some few lines lower down) the person *spoken* to 128.

Ev. having *broke* the glass II.222 (Br.); the lamps are *broke* II.120 (Br.); the coach would be *broke* down II.221 (Br.); the glass being *broke* II.222 (Br.); — had he *broke* it III.30; we're all *spoke* first II.114 (Miss Br.); the villain has *stole* all my curls II.31 (D).

¹ In all these instances *get* is used as a verb of motion. For further ex. see below p. 100.

In connection with *to be*, *gotten* is much commoner, 13 *gotten* to only 5 *got*:

They are *got* safe ashore 104.24, 351.3, 5; Some were *got* up 357.36; We were *gotten* far enough 36.9.

Of *forgot*, *forgotten* there are only two instances:

I had *forgot* what I learn'd 172.13. My Tears being *forgotten* 9.18.

We had *rid* 10.11; A Ship who had *rid* 13.14; The Captain had *writ* 41.32.

With regard to the pa. pple. forms of *bid*, *bite*, (*hide*), *ride*, *write* special attention ought to be called to the fact that Defoe in RC only uses the shortened forms *bid*, *writ*, etc. In other works of Defoe and his contemporaries, on the other hand, the full forms *bidden*, *written*, etc. occur either alone, or also side by side with the abbreviated ones; see note 1 p. 76 ff.¹

*

I could quote a considerable number of similar pa. pple. forms such as those mentioned above in section α and β , not only from other writings by Defoe, but also by Addison, Steele, Swift, Pope, etc. besides those given, and moreover such as are not to be found in any of the grammatical works mentioned in my Bibliography. But I trust those above will be quite sufficient to show not only how exceedingly common such pa. pple. forms as *shook*, *broke*, etc. were, but also that they were undoubtedly considered quite correct by the classical authors of the 18th century.

*

¹ To show how vague the distinction was between the forms *writ* (both pret. and pa. pple.) and *written* I may quote the corrections made by Dryden himself in the text of his *Essay on Dram. Poetry* (1668): pa. pple. *writ* > *written* 14.17; who *writ* > who had *writ* 8.19; (page and line refer to SMITH's ed.).

All other strong verbs occurring in RC have only such pa. pple. forms as are recognized in present day standard English, e. g.:

She was *beaten* in Pieces 263.28; had *chosen* 148.28; Ships being *driven* 11.18; had *eaten* 57.26; being *eaten* 146.35; are *fallen* 214.23; God had *forsaken* him 188.35; have *given* 37.22; (I had *hit* him 31.14); they were *shot* out and *grown* with . . . 123.35; have *sunk* 250.7; being *sunk* 34.22; they got her *slung* over the Ship's-side 49.31; to have *spoken* 222.16; the *rooting* them out . . . is *spoken* of 203.15; the first Word I ever heard *spoken* 140.33; the Ship having *struck* upon the Sand 49.14; I was *struck* with Surprize 210.10; 109.4; had I *thrown* 92.10; *overthrown* 93.11; had *trod* 186.33; I found them *trod* to Pieces 118.1; had *worn* 158.32; was *worn* 103.5.

*

If we now turn to the grammars¹, we shall find that pa. pple. forms like *began*, *drank*, etc. must be considered to be far less in vogue; the *u* forms being the only ones mentioned at all. Only once (in Lediard) have I found an *a* form *sprang*, but with a + to show that it is 'not proper or usual'.²

On the other pa. pple. forms, on the contrary, the grammars have long dissertations, but agree with each other in the main.

WALLIS (Participia in *en*, p. 94) tells us that 'tam *written*, *bitten*, *eaten*, *beaten*, *hidden*, *chidden*, *shotten*, *rotten* (not in

¹ As the verbs belonging to sections α and β are in the grammars quoted always treated together, I did not deem it necessary to separate them in these grammatical notes. The mutual order of the verbs has always been retained the same as in other passages quoted. — For PE usage see NED and the grammatical works, etc. given above in Bibliography p. VIII ff.

² For further information concerning the use in the 18th and 19th centuries see esp. KLAPPERICH p. 14; Anglia 17.486 ff.; STORM pp. 686, 687 and NED.

Johnson) *chosen, broken, etc.* quam *writt, bitt, eat, beat, hidd, chidd, shott, rott, chose, broke, etc.* a verbis *write* etc. promiscue efferuntur' and on page 97: *take, etc.* faciunt *utrobique took, shook, forsook, woke, awoke, stood, broke, spoke, bore, shore, swore, tore, wore, wove, clove, strove, throve, drove, shone, rose, arose, smote, wrote, bode, abode, rode, chose, trod, got, begot, forgot, sod...* In *Participio Passivo* formantur eorum non pauca per *en*; ut *taken, shaken* etc... *(be)gotten, forgotten, sodden* (all but of *(a)wake, stand, shine, abide*).

The pronouncements of the grammarians of Defoe's own day, MAITTAIRE, GREENWOOD and LEDIARD, only serve to show how very unsettled the state with respect to the usage of these pa. pple. forms still was.

MATTAIRE (p. 88) seems to give decided preference to the abbreviated pa. pple. forms, putting forms like *got, wove, clove, stole, trod, bid* before *gotten, woven, cloven, stol'n, trodden, bidden*, etc.

LED. generally gives both forms as *bit(ten); broke(n); drunk(en); got(ten); [hid(den)]; rid(den); shook(en) (sic!); spoke(n); trod(den);* but where this method of abbreviation cannot be employed he always places the shorter forms first, as *drove, driven; throve, thriven; (GR. only driven, thriven); wrote, writ, written; took, taken; tore, torn, etc.*

GR. in his list of verbs (p. 158 ff.) always places the forms in *-en* first, e. g. *broken* and *broke; ridden* or *rode; (spitten, spit and spat; LED. only spit); stolen* or *stole; stricken and struck (LED. only struck); sworn* only, as LED.; *written, writ and wrote;* but he also speaks of (p. 157) the promiscuous use of the 'Passive participle', stating that 'we do also use *written, bitten, eaten, beaten, shotten, rotten, chosen, broken*, as well as *writ, bit, eat, beat, shot, rot, chose, broke*, etc. in the Passive Participle though not in the Preter. Tense'.

Some few pages further on (p. 169) he gives in Chapter XIX 'Of the Formation of the Times of the Verb Passive' his opinion on the use of the different pple. forms *writ, written; spoke, spoken*, etc. This, I think, is rather interesting and well worth quoting, both as a counterpart to the examples given above, and to the opinion set forth by Johnson in

his dictionary. The ending *en*, Greenwood states, 'is frequently neglected in the Tenses of the Active Verb formed by *Have* and *Had*; as, *I have* or *I had spoke* to him. Yet when this Participle is used as an *Adjective* or helps to make the Passive Verb, it is better and more usual to use the Ending *en*, as; *It is a written Book, not a writ Book; It is spoken abroad, not, spoke abroad; It was written, not writ.*'

'Concerning these double participles' copied from Wallis (also '*loaden, laden* as well as *loaded, laded*'), JOHNSON tells us that 'it is difficult to give any rule; but', he continues, 'he shall seldom err who remembers that, when a verb has a participle distinct from its preterit, as *write, wrote, written*, that distinct participle is more proper and elegant, as *The book is written* is better than the *book is wrote*. — *Wrote* however may be used in poetry; at least if we allow any authority to poets, who, in the exultation of genius, think themselves perhaps entitled to trample on grammarians'.

If we now examine his Dictionary we shall find that his statements here do not quite agree with those set forth in his grammar. Double forms like *bid, bidden; shook, shaken*, etc. are given of the following verbs: *bear, beat, bid, bite, break, (chide, chid, chidden), choose, drink (drunk-en), drive (driven or drove), eat, forsake, get, (hide), ride (rid ridden), shake ('shook in poetry'), shoot, sink (sunk, sunken), smite (smit, smitten), strike ('struck, stricken the old participle passive, stricken the ancient participle, strook¹), take ('sometimes took'). tread, weave, write (written, writ or wrote).*

On account of the somewhat unclear method of arranging the strong verbs used by WARD it is often very difficult to get at his real meaning with any degree of certainty. On the whole however he seems to share the opinion advanced by Johnson, augmenting the above list collected from JDICT, only by the verbs (*chide*), *seeth* (+ *sod, sodden*), *sit (sat-sitten)*, *slide, speak, steal, stride (strode-stridden)*. — *Born, drunk, eaten, forsaken, (shake not mentioned), sunk*, on the other hand, are the only pa. pples. given. As far as I have been

¹ On the use of this pa. pple. form JDICT. gives no special information; cf. pret. *strook* p. 67.

able to find out, he himself does not use any other participles in the text of his work than such as are considered standard forms in PE.

According to Storm (p. 810), Johnson does not himself use in his own writings forms like *writ*, *wrote*, etc., but only those now recognized, i. e. *written*, etc. In order, if possible, to check this statement I have perused a few hundred pages of Johnson's works and discover that it agrees with the actual circumstances. That such forms were probably not considered quite correct already after the middle of the century might also be supported by the fact that in Ev. the author generally makes only those of his characters use such forms, whom he wanted to represent as careless or vulgar of speech. To further strengthen this opinion I may refer to PEGGE's statement (p. 123): 'Already towards the end of the century participles like *took*, *rose*, *fell*, *wrote* though still employed by many authors, were yet felt as rather vulgar'.¹

Weak Verbs.

1. There is not very much to be said about the weak (regular) verbs. — In regard to certain verbs, which even in PE have double pret. and pa. pples., I have, however, considered it to be of some interest to find out how matters stood in Defoe's time, and esp. in RC.

The only pret. and pa. pple. forms of **dream**, **kneel**, **smell**, **spoil**, **build**, **learn** are in RC *dream'd* (11 ex: only pret.); *kneel'd* (6 ex: only pret.); *spoil'd* (12 ex: 2 pret., 10 pa. pples.); *smell'd* (1 ex: pret.); *builded* (1 ex: pa. pple.); *learn'd* (20 ex: 15 pret., 5 pa. pples.). — In the case of *builded*, this form is in B altered to *built*; the same applies to *learn'd*, which in four instances (84.10, 114.24, 122.17; 98.14) has been altered to *learnt*. Examples:

¹ On 19th cent. Engl. use, esp. in vulgar and dialectal speech, see among others, FR. DIAL. 217; STORM 753, 809, 830 etc.; SWEET 404 ff.; WRIGHT 281 ff.

I *dream'd* 218.34, 37: 235.9, 10; I *kneel'd* 110.31; he *kneel'd* down 235.23; I *learn'd* him 140.31; having *learn'd* him 253.20; She *smell'd* of it 63.19; I *spoil'd* 159.37; had *spoil'd* 228.11; what was *spoil'd* 64.31; the Corn should remain *unspoil'd* 92.6; — I had gotten Timber enough to have *builded* (B *built*) a Boat 100.21; I *learn'd* (B *learnt*) 84.10; I had *learn'd* (B *learnt*) 98.14.

Of the verbs **burn**, **dwell** and **mean**, on the other hand, no other pret. and pa. pple. forms occur in A than *burnt* (6 ex: 3 pret., 3 pa. pples.); *dwellt* (1 ex. pret.) *meant* (13 ex: 12 pret., 1 pa. pple.) — In five cases (253.24; 255.26, 33, 34, 35) the pret. form *meant* has been altered to *mean'd* in B. Examples:

I *burnt* 110.1; it had been *burnt* 92.11; a Vessel *burnt* in the Sun 35.19; there *dwellt* 255.22; he *meant* 30.37; what was *meant* 13.36; he *meant* (B *mean'd*) 255.26.

*

With respect to these and similar forms it is extremely difficult, on account of, amongst other things, the scanty and rather inexplicit information we can obtain from grammatical works of the time, to decide whether, for instance, such a form as *learn'd* was really distinct in pronunciation from *learnt* or not.¹ Neither can we get any definite idea from

¹ In this connection I may be permitted to mention some purely *orthographical* peculiarities of the time in the case of forming the pret. and pa. pple. of the weak verbs (cf. p. 22). — Side by side with the full ending *ed* as *envied*, *fastened*, etc. we find, perhaps equally often — at least in RC — the apostrophized ending *'d* (both after a voiced and voiceless sound): *envy'd*, *fasten'd*, *look'd* *ste(p)b'd*, *pass'd*, *scorch'd* etc. — This style of spelling seems, as a rule, to have been approved of by the contemporary grammarians, even Dr. Johnson. Swift (Ta. 230, Prop. p. 21) and Addison (Sp. 135) and the author of 'Observations', on the other hand, express their decided disapproval of this style of writing 'that has very much disfigured the tongue'. After the middle of the century such forms occur very rarely in prose works (cf. p. XXIV).

the statements of the grammarians, or, on account of the unsettled use of the language made by the novelists, etc. of the time, as to which of these forms they considered preferable (see, e. g. JGr.).¹ — For PE usage see NED, Sweet p. 396 ff. and Krieger II. 154.

There is besides, in the case of verbs ending in a voiceless consonant, a further method of forming these tenses, viz. by adding the ending *t*, e. g.:

lookt 17.5; markt 219.5; workt 17.19; clapt 219.18; dipt 60.3; dropt 92.7; jump't 235.16; outstript 239.19; stept 36.3; stoopt 24.37; stopt 173.31; wrapt 53.13; imprest 17.9; we past 47.2; had past 167.32; is past 103.19 (cf. PE); tōst 25.2: harrast 4.6; mixt 117.9; crusht 222.36; fisht 24.27; catcht 24.27; reacht 24.23; scorcht 358.2

which forms occur alternately with *look'd*-*looked*, etc. In the printed works of the time (PY, TT, Ta., Sp., etc.) such phonetically spelt pret. and pa. pple. forms seem to be at least equally common as in RC. In Defoe's MSS, e. g. CG, they are even much more common than in RC; (cf. p. 22). — It is specially noteworthy that Swift, who always blames the use of 'contracted forms' and never uses any apostrophized pret. or pa. pple. forms in his letters, very often employs such forms in his MSS, e. g. Sw. Let: stackt 2, dropt 13, stoppt 23, addrest 44, mixt 31, reacht 50; cf. note p. 25.

This phonetic way of spelling, which was prevalent right through the whole of the 18th and even into the 19th cent., is mentioned and more or less warmly advocated by contemporary grammarians from the beginning of the 18th cent. According to Dr. Johnson, in the middle of the cent., 't is used in pronunciation, but very seldom in writing, rather than *d*'. — With reference to PE endeavours in this direction see amongst others HORN pp. 12, 149; ESt. 17.283; Angl. Beibl. 4.38 and KALUZA, p. 197.

¹ PY (Only) *built* 161; 173; they *dwelt* 132; it *spoil'd* 279; was *spoil'd* 134 = MF 23;

CG (Only) *meant* 49; 139 = Ta. 14.5; she *smelt* 239; I am a *spoilt* man 191.

Whilst *burnt* seems to be the only form in PY, REd. and CG, (e. g. were *burnt* PY 109 = CG 154; they *burnt* REd. 46, etc.) *learnt* and *learn'd* alternate. *Learn'd* appears however to be the form gen. used, except in REd. where only *learnt* occurs (pp. 42, 46, etc.), e. g.:

CG he *learn'd* 216 = MF 13, CS 46; having *learned* 100 = MF 43; things are *learned* 197; few *learned* writers 209; the most *learn'd* 204; —

2. Preterite and past participle of *catch, work.*¹

In the preterite the PE 'irregular' form *caught* is predominant: 5 *caught* to 2 *catch'd* being found. In the pa. pple., however, the 'regular' form *catch'd*, *catcht* (2 ex.) is even commoner than *caught* (1 ex.):

— is there nothing to be *learnt* because we *learn't* nothing 196 = MF 33, CS 6; he had *learn'd* it as a speech as well as *learnt*... 207.

Regarding other contemp. works I confine myself to only a few ex:

TT he *dream'd* 272; is *built* 41.246; it *burnt* 265; had *dwelt* 243, to be *dwelt* on 143; The Nauplians *learned* the Art 83; they *have learnt* 5; he *meant* 13.4 = Intr. 2; it *smelt* 112; had *spoiled* 262.

Sp. is *built* 266.2; I *learned* 115.8; Things to be *spoiled* 132; the groom has *spoil'd* the Pad 88.1.

¹ **RC II** Things *catch'd* out of the Flames 24.

PY the People *catch'd* the Distemper 92; when any one Body had *catch'd* the Distemper 65; he *caught* 184 — *Work* quite as in PE: — they *work'd* on 115; John *wrought* so upon the Townsmen that they went away 165.

CG *Caught* (pret. 271, pa. pple. 28) as in PE. — we know not know 'tis (the intellectuall part) is *wrought* 109; the strait tree is *wrought* with less pains than the crooked 109.

Ta. My Mother *catch'd* me in her Arms (DEFOE) 181.2; — This is an effect *wrought* by meer Lights and Shades 8.1; This Passage *wrought* my Imagination into the following Drama 146.3.

Sp. The Appearance of the Ghost (in Hamlet) is a Master-piece in its kind and *wrought* up with all the Circumstances that can create either Attention or Horror 44.1; The sound of it was exceeding sweet, and *wrought* into a variety of tunes that were inexpressibly melodious 159.2; The Materials are no sooner *wrought* into Paper 367.3; Utensils *wrought* in Brass 585.7.

[*Wrought* was, however, used rather late in the signification of *made*, even by the very best authors, as will be clear from the following ex. from Goldsmith (STOFFEL VW): They *wrought* with chearfulness on days of labour, — Further ex. in STORM pp. 686,809.]

Ev. *Caught* is practically the only occurring form: — they've *caught* 1.160 (Br.) — But yet I have come across one instance of *catch'd* in the

I *caught* Fish 98.26; Fowls, who I *caught* 214.6; I would have *caught* one 128.15. — I *catch'd* it 87.27; I *catch'd* hold of Friday 249.36; we had *catcht* nothing 24.27; I had *catch'd* 134.28.

The only instance of *wrought* in RC, used as a pa. pple. occurs on page 79.29:

I had *wrought* out some Boards.

In all other cases the pret. and pa. pple. form of *work* is *work'd*, e. g.:

We *work'd* on 13.9; I had *work'd* so hard 192.24, etc.

*

The rather divergent statements of the grammarians concerning the past tenses of these verbs (*catch*, *work*) may be taken as a reflex of the anything but settled use of the day. — WALLIS's statement (p. 96): 'Teach, reach, seek, beseech, *catch*, *work* faciunt *taught*, *raught*, *sought*, *besought*, *caught*, *wrought*. Sed et ex his non pauca analogiam retinent ut *teached*, *reached*, *beseeched*, *catched*, *worked*, etc'. seems to infer that he preferred the irregular forms to the regular ones. The same applies to GREENWOOD who gives *caught* (only this form), *wrought* and *work'd*. MAITTAIRE, on the other hand, seems to prefer the regular form: '*catch't* or *caught'* and LEDIARD indicates by a + that the irregular forms are in his opinion obsolete: '*catcht*, + *caught*; *work'd*, + *wrought*'.

In JGR. the above statement by Wallis is, as usual, only plagiarized. In JDICT. the forms are given as follows: '*taught*, sometimes *teached*, which is now obsolete; *reached*, ancient preterite *raught*; *sought*; *besought*; *catched* or *caught*; *worked* or *wrought*'.

text; but as it is printed in italics, I think the author herewith only wanted to indicate it as a rendering of Br:s. own vulgar way of speaking: —'the brother was highly delighted, he said, that his sisters had been *catched*' II.79.

Mixing of strong and weak inflection.

Preterite and past participle forms of dig; blow, load.

Dig. *Dug* is the common form: In the pret. always *dug*, 5 ex.; pa. pple. 4 ex. The pa. pple. form *digged* occurs only once:

I *dug* 86.3; I had *dug* 190.3; 136.3; It was to be *dug* 150.37; — they were fallen into the Pit they had *digged* for others 326.32.¹

As far as I can see this is the only instance of *digged* occurring in all the 18th century writings I have gone through. In view of Defoe's unusual knowledge of the Bible it is quite possible that this passage may only be looked upon as a reminiscence thereof; cf. p. 14 and Krüger III.411.

Blow. The PE forms *blew*, *blown* are by far the commonest: 6 pret. *blew*, and 4 pa. pple. *blown*: of *blow'd* (pa. pple.) only one instance occurs; e. g.:

It *blew* 10.13; had it *blown* 24.21: my Powder being *blown* up 73.31; I saw some Pieces *blown* on Sho re 100.1 147.16; — it had *blow'd* hard 99.33.²

Load. Together with the auxiliary verb *have* the form *loaded* is the only one met with (4 ex.):

¹ PY *Dug* only: they *dug*, had *dug* 71; be *dug* 72, etc.

CG *Dug* only: is *dug* up 42, 163, etc. — In other contemp. works I have not come across any ex. of *dug*, *digged*.

² PY they *blow'd* up a Watchman 64; the wind *blow'd* from the side where... 147; — the Wind *blew* 147; he *blew* up the Roof 280.

CG The post *blow'd* his horn 126 (in a note written by Defoe himself).

TT only *blew* 149, *blown* 148, etc.

I had Grapes to have *loaded* that Fleet 152.8; 229.15; I had *loaded* my gun 34.6; We had but little more than *loaded* our Fusees 355.24.

With *to be*, on the other hand, *loaden* is practically the rule (9 ex.):

Ships being deep *loaden* 11.16; 12.11; being *loaden* with Arms 217.3; 278.14; the Raft was *overloaden* 65.10; one Gun and that *loaden* with small Shot 206.15; the Musket which was *loaden* 278.8; our Pieces were *loaden* with Swan shot 277.36.

Only in a single similar instance have I found the form *loaded* used:

I would place myself in Ambush with my Guns all double *loaded* 199.34.¹

Note. The PE participle form *laden*, on the analogy of which *loaden* was formed, and which is very often found in the 'exactly reprinted editions' is not found in RC. Cf. note 1 below.

¹ **RC II** a *loaden* Ship. 12.

PY Servants *loaded* with Baggage 9. — Vessels *loaden* with corn 252; Goods to be *unloaden* 175; — The inf. form is gen. *(un)lade*, e. g. 246, 247; to *unlade*... the Vessels *loaden* with Corn 256.

CG be *loaded* and opprest with heavy particles 85; His estate is heavily *loaded* 250; — they left him *loaden* with wealth 6; a musqueteer *loaden* with 7 bullets 30.

TT They have *loaded* him with Curses 301. — Air *loaden* by Words 39; Pockets *loaden* with Stones 204; *laden* with his Spoils 274.

Ta. Vessels *laden* with Corn 21.25.

Sp. I saw them march out, the Brother *loaded* with a great cheese 266.5; the Thames *loaded* with..., 454.3. — The Men would have *loaden* themselves 499.3; Sticks *loaden* with Lead 113.8; Men as heavy *loaden* as... 558.6; finding herself so *overloaden* 499.4; 499.5.

Note. In PE the verbs (*a*)*wake* and *swell* may occur both with weak and strong forms. See KRUGER II.157 ff; III.411 ff; SWEET pp. 414, 419. — In RC the weak forms are the only ones occurring, e. g: the Noise *awak'd* me 94.8; when I *awak'd* 111.15; when I *wak'd* 54.31; 111.3, etc. (5 ex.); his Ankles were very much *swell'd* with the Bandage 284.9; 358.36. — Between *hang'd* and *hung* the difference in use and signification is quite the same as is given by NED, e. g: I *hung* my Sword 274.2; the Hair *hung* down 176.13; he would be *hang'd* 318.31, etc. — In PY (*a*)*wake* and *hang* are inflected in the same way as in RC, e. g: he *awaked* 107, he has been *hang'd* 99, etc. — TT having *swelled* himself (usually) 245; *swollen* up by 243.

*

As is well known there is in the language, and esp. in the speech of the lower classes, a general tendency to uniformity in the verb inflection, either by keeping to the old weak forms, or by replacing the strong forms by weak ones. That this tendency was very strong in the 17th and the beginning of the 18th century appears clearly enough, not only from the writings of the acknowledged best authors of the early part of the 18th century.¹

Thus, for instance, WALLIS states (p. 95): 'Item (see p. 80) promiscue formantur Participia *sow'n*, *loaden*, *laden*; atque, *sow'd*, *shew'd*, *hew'd* *mow'd*, *loaded*, *laded* (I).² To these weak forms he adds (p. 97) some others dealing with the pret. and pa. pple. forms of verbs like *take*, *speake*, etc. suggesting here that some verbs instead of the common pret. and pa. pple. form *took*, *woke*, etc. (see p. 81) have another

¹ RC II every Thing grew and *thrived* 92.

TT it (the Vine) *thrived* the better 83.

Ta. a Sea which *shaked* 8.5; he *shaked* his Head 14.5; Pacolet *shaked* his Head 48.4. (All these three papers are written by STEELE).

Sp. I *shaked* my Head (STEELE) 4.5; he *shined* 61.3; The Thought is such an one as would have *shined* in Homer 74.23; a Net that he has *wearead* 108.3.

PC she *ris'd* 462. Ed. Saintsbury (L. 1892) p. 179 reads *ris'*.

² The Roman figures referring to a certain statement in WALLIS, correspond to those found below in my account of JGr. and JDict.

weak form due to analogy with the weak verbs as: *waked*, *awaked*, *beared*, *sheared*, *weared* (ed. 1688), *weaved*, *thrived*, *choosed*, etc. (II). And some few lines further below he says under 'Preterita imperfecta': *drew*, *blew* *knew*, etc., and 'Participia Passiva per *en*': *draw'n* *know'n* *blow'n*, etc.: 'Sed et utrobique *draw'd*, *snow'd*, *throw'd*, *blow'd*, *crow'd* (III). Moreover in connection with pret. and pa. pple. forms of vbs. such as *win*, *spin*, etc. (IV) he says (p. 96): 'Sed et utrobique forma analogia fere in omnibus retinetur, ut *spinned*, *swimmed*, etc'.

Of the grammarians of Defoe's day BRIGHTLAND (p. 93 ff.) almost entirely follows Wallis's statements and differs from him only in so far as he leaves out the weak form *throw'd*, but on the other hand he professes a preference for the weak pret. form of *blow*: '*blew* (or rather *blow'd*)'. — GREENWOOD certainly copied Wallis's statement I; the same is the case with JGr. As regards other verbs pointed out it may be worth while to note the following. Of the verbs *awake*, *blow*, *hang*, he gives exclusively strong forms; the pret. and pa. pple. forms of *dig*, *swell* and *thrive*, however, he quotes in the following manner: *dug* and **digged*; *sweld* pret; *swol'n* or *swel'd* pa. pple.; *throve* and **thrived*. ['Those that have this Mark* before them are not proper or usual'. — Note by Gr.]. — LEDIARD gives *awoke*, *awake*; *blow'd*, *blow'd*; *digged*, *dug*; *hang'd*. As he is silent concerning *load* and *swell*, I think we may, judging from his general predilection for weak forms, presume that he regards the weak forms *loaded*, *swell'd* to be the only 'usual and proper' ones.

If we now compare Wallis's statements with the forms given by Dr. JOHNSON, we find that a decided change in the language took place in the middle of the 18th cent. — JGr., which otherwise plagiarizes Wallis practically word for word, has in part completely excluded his statements III and IV; in section II the verbs *beared*, *choosed*, *thrived* are omitted. — In JDICT. we find only strong forms in the pa. pple. of *load* and *mow* (I). Likewise only strong forms of *spin*, *win* (IV), *blow*, *draw*, *throw* (III) are given. In the case of *crow* double forms are quoted; of *snow* only the weak inflection

is given. *Sheared*, *weaved* and *wringed* are certainly placed on the same level as the corresponding strong forms: pret. *shore* and *sheared*, pa. pple. *shorn*; pret. *wove* and *weaved*, pa. pple. *woven* and *weaved*; *wringed* and *wrung*; but according to his opinion the weak forms of *shine*, *strive* and *thrive* do not belong to the ordinary use of the language of his period. All the other verbs in section II are given with the strong forms only. — The forms given as correct by WARD agree on the whole with PE standard use.

The possibility is not to be entirely lost sight of that Dr. Johnson, on account of the sway he held by reason of his Dictionary, and by means of the opinions expressed by him therein, may have influenced his contemporary authors and probably in this way hastened the disappearance from literary English of such weak forms as those mentioned above. Whatever the circumstances may be (cf. Bradley p. 51), it is, however, a fact that this levelling tendency began to receive a check already in the latter part of the 18th century and in Ev., for example, it is only the extremely vulgar Madame Duval whom the author makes use such forms.¹

Concerning PE use see NED and modern gram. works, esp. Hall (p. 206) *Our grandfathers' English* and *Recent Ex.* p. 65, where numerous instances of all these forms mentioned above are given.

Auxiliaries.

Wert. The modern analogical *wast* has displaced the etymological *were*, chiefly under the influence of Tindale and the Bible; the intermediate *wert* (Shakespeare's form) prevailed in literature during the 17th and 18th centuries, and has been used by many 19th century writers (NED). — In RC *wert* is the only form occurring:

¹ Ev. what is *becomed* of my hair II.31; have *comed* II.150; So you are *comed* here II.131; you *knowed* I.122; II.32; had *runn'd* I.123; he had *shooked* II.33; is *tooked* up II.14.

Why is it that thou *wert* not long ago destroy'd? Why
wert thou not drown'd 108.34.¹

LEDIARD (p. 427) mentions the occurrence of *wert* for *wast*, which he thinks is 'ein Vitium und also gar nicht zu gebrauchen'.

*

Wa'n't. This form, that is sometimes met with in 18th century dramatists, occurs a couple of times in Defoe:

I warrant yow were frighted, *wa'n't* you 8.37.²

¹ For further ex. from 18th cent. authors see NED.

² CG I think you was nurst abroad, *wa'n't* you 51.

In this connection, I think, I may be allowed to call attention to the very common 18th cent. use of *was* instead of *were* when referring to only one person, now generally considered rather careless, e. g.:

CG *you was* nurst abroad, *wa'nt* you 51; *Was not you* at the tavern 226; — *you was* so sharp upon me 49. [The last words are the utterances of the younger, 'educated' brother].

Sp. *You was* my Master's Friend [in a letter from a butler] 517.2.

Ev. if *you wasn't* the most impudentest person II.153; I.95 (D); 'twas plaguy unlucky, *you was* not with him II.13 (c); *you was* never so happy II.120 (Br.); *you are* paler than *you was* III.8; If *you was* not the cruellest angel III.77. [The last two passages are put in the mouth of a lord].

As will be seen from the examples given, it is not only in the speech of vulgar and careless people that we find this peculiarity; it was widely spread long after the middle of the cent., even among persons of rank and education; (cf. NED; HALL p. 206; STORM pp. 745, 753; SWEET p. 426).

This usage is also sanctioned by the grammarians of the day. LEDIARD (p. 427) refers to it in the following note: 'Im Imperfecto gar oft mit dem Pronomen im Plural *you* und mit dem Verbum im Singular *was*: *you was*, statt *were*'. — The same is stated by GREENWOOD p. 164: 'Singular: *You were* or *you was* *burning*' (cf. an ex. on page 167: 'What was *you a* doing? *I was'*...), and GR. 1737 p. 85: 'thou *wast* or *you was* *burning*; Plural: *ye* or *you were*'...

The form occurring together with other expressions denoting colloquial language (*you're*, *d'ye*, etc.) may possibly be looked upon as an attempt at giving a dialectal touch to the speech of the simple sailor in whose mouth they are put.

B. Periphrastic Tenses.

I. The formation of the perfect and pluperfect of certain intransitive verbs.

The OE and — though to a less extent — the ME mode of forming the perfect and pluperfect of all intransitive verbs with *to be*, still survives as a very characteristic feature of the language of Defoe and other 18th century authors in general, esp. so far as verbs of *motion*, *change* (*increasing*, *decreasing*) and the like are concerned. — In the following collection of examples, which I trust is fairly complete, I have adduced all such verbs as in ME historical grammars, etc. are generally given as occurring conjugated with *be*. By this statistical investigation, I think I have proved that in RC the use of *be* is far commoner than that of *have*. Concerning other works of Defoe I regret that I have had no opportunity of making equally careful researches, but I presume one would not be far wrong in saying that in the other works of Defoe at least, more or less the same phenomena occur as in RC;¹ with Defoe's contemporaries this use

¹ The examples which I have collected from PY (287 pp.), illustrating the relative frequency of *have* and *be*, have left upon me the impression that the use of *be* is even more frequent there than in RC. — Owing to the great difference in subject and treatment between RC and CG it is not in the least surprising to find such a small number, comparatively speaking, of instances of verbs conjugated with *to be* in CG. The proportion between the use of the two auxiliaries seems, however, to be the same as in RC. Cf p. 101.

seems to be somewhat less in favour. — In the latter part of the century the use seems to be very much on the decrease, the examples found in Ev. (700 pp.) not being very numerous.¹

¹ PY they answered, that the Plague *was abated* (8 ex.) and the Bills *decreased* almost 2000 283; 64; 131; 198; 240; 259; 263; 283 — It was a Fortnight after this... then the Case *was a little altered*, and the Plague *was exceedingly advanced* 144 — some Body asked what *was become* of him 86 — The Plague *was scarce begun* and not at all come down to that part 281; 33; 42 — three Companies of Men who *were broke* out from London 160; 34 — they found their Patients better, either they had sweated kindly, or the Tumours *were broke* 284 — This alarm'd us the Weather *being chang'd* and growing warm 13 — it was three Year after the Plague *was ceas'd* that... 267 — The Plague *was not yet come* to its Height 240; Bodies *being come* to lie within six Foot of the Surface 72; 1; 74; 101; 142; 143; 152; 152; 163; 167; 170; 188; 205; 225; 258; 269; 280; 281 (19 ex.) — There was not 10 People that died till after August *was expired* 131 — The Churches where they *were fled* away 32; People who... the Plague being come into that Town, *were fled* further 163; 60; 87; 101; 121; 134; 171; 173; 248; 255 (11 ex.) — The infection *was gotten* into several Streets 7 — Several Children *being all gone* and fled 60; Such People *were gone* and vanish'd 205; The News *was gone* over the whole World 247; Some heard Voices warning them to *be gone*, for... 26; 3; 21; 60; 81; 101; 103; 136; 139; 164; 185; 194; 208; 219; 240; 245; 254; 276; 284 (23 ex.) — The Work *was grown* so dangerous 119; 22 — there *was* no Disaster of that kind *happen'd* in the whole Year 190 — tho' the Number of all the Burials *were not increased* above 32 and the whole Bill being but 385, yet there was 14 of the Spotted-Feaver 7 — they had flatter'd themselves... and thought the Bitterness of Death *was past* 206; 262 — The People *being return'd* 266; 1; 14 — The Bills (of Deaths) *were risen* to almost 700 a Weak, and he told me he would venture to stay no longer 14; 144 — the many desperate Things which the People *were frequently run* upon at that time 187 — they had very little Notice of their being infected till the Gangreen *was spread* thro' their whole Body 98 — he would cry: Now it (the Ghost) comes this Way: Then, 'Tis turn'd back 29; no sooner *was* the Cart turned round, but he cry'd out... 74.

CG they *are become* the scoff of their inferiours 63; 81; 167; 256 —

Abate, 2 ex. tho' the Storm was abated, yet the Sea went dreadful high 49; 8.

Become, 5 ex. she was become a Widow 330; I never knew... what was become of me 2; 13; 306; 307.

Their eldest brother *being* just come home from his travels 269; 190 — the rate *is fallen*, and they are not so estem'd as before 230 — But we *are* now *gotten* too far back (REd. 19) — He *is gone* down to the mansion house 269; the clergy-men rose up, as if they would *be gon* 47; 57; 144; 160; 266 — the contaminacion *is grown* up with him 80; 83 — London *is risen* again from the dead 39.

Sw. Let. their Prosecutions *being* now just come to an Issue 8; 1; 2; 21; 37 — I am glad you *are got* into a new Tast of... 46 — Mr Jervas *is gone* to England 21; 21; 34; 59 — I hope you *are grown* regular in your Plantations 33; 15; 30 — Nay 'tis said the Pretender *is landed* 15 — The ArchbP *is just recovered* after having been despaired of 46 — I *am* now *relapsed* into my old Disease 36 — Mr Stopford *is returned* from his Travells 34.

Ta. We hear that Sir Edward Whit *was arrived* at that Port 21.16; He *was arrived* at a Satiety of Glory 64.6 — since that Custom *is now become* a Law, I know nothing 93.7 — he *is come* to Paris for the Benefit of the Air 70.12 — you *are now got* into an useful Subject 70.10; the Birds *were got* together in a thick Shade 229.8 — he would not enter upon this Subject, till it *was grown* as indifferent to him as any other 242.7 — There *are* three Brothers lately *landed* from Holland 24.5 — his Dog *is run* mad 146.1.

Sp. when we *were almost arrived* at London 147.1 — Tables that *are come* from Father to Son 311.7. — Boys... when they *are got* into Latin 147.1 — Sir Andrew *is grown* the Cock of the Club 131.9; 311.5; that which was at first the effect of Instruction *is grown* into Habit 79.6 — the Hangings you formerly mentioned *are run away* 36.2 — We *were* no sooner *sat down* but... 57.7; 7.1.

Ev. He *is become* my friend 1.83 — I *am come* to introduce you III.196 — What, *rn't* Miss Polly *come* yet II.134 (Mr. Brown) — when not a fortnight *is yet expired* II.161 — the pistols *were fallen* close by me II.99 — you *are got* into bad hands III.7; II.33 (D) — they *were gone* up stairs III.121. — Madame Duval, who *was just risen* II.40 — they will suppose I *am run* away III.53.

Befall. This is *befallen* us on your Account 15.

Blow. I would go and look at our Boat, which *was blown* up upon the Shore 147.

Break. we fancy'd the Ship would break in Pieces, and some told us she *was* actually *broken* already 49.

Burn. When the Fire-wood *was burnt* into live Coals, I drew them forward upon the Hearth 145.

Come, 20 ex. when I *was come* down the Hill 194; for now *being come* down on the Gascoign side, we . . . 349; My Father's Words *are come* to pass 106; 7; 12; 121; 125; 130; 132; 151; 188; 273; 295; 305; 312; 319; 344; 346; 353; 360.

Drive, 6 ex. We knew nothing upon what Land we *were driven* 48; I examin'd the Barrel which *was driven* on Shore 97; 54; 81; 97; 219.

Ebb, 3 ex. the Tide *was ebb'd* out 100; the Water *being ebb'd* out, I could see . . . 226; 299.

Encrease, 2 ex. it was not sufficient for my Family, now it *was enreas'd* to Number four 291; I sent them some Hogs, which, when I came again, *were* considerably *enreas'd* 364.

Enter, 3 ex. after I *was enter'd* the little Cove, it (the Raft) overset 65; I *was* now *entred* on the seven and twentieth Year 271; 349.

Fall, 6 ex. They *were fallen* into the Pit 326; much Snow *was fallen* 344; the Evil which we *are fallen* into 214; 214; 263; 280.

Flutter. the Parrot *was flutter'd* away 251.

Founder. They cry'd out that a Ship *was founder'd* 11.

Get (got), 5 ex. . . . there *was* Friday *got* out to the small End 351; When I *was got* through the Strait 211; 104; 351; 357.

Get (gotten), 13 ex. The Ship *was* no sooner *gotten* out of the Humber, but . . . 7; The Captain *was gotten* up and . . . had *gotten* Fire Arms 322; He *was gotten* over his Fright 274; 36; 39; 47; 66; 80; 165; 182; 282; 282; 315 (cf. p. 79).

Go, 21 ex. I then led him up to see if his Enemies
G. Lannert.

were gone 245; I found they *were* all gone straggling into the Woods 301; the Boat, *being gone* a good way, they... 314; I took a small Sup of Rum... knowing I could have no more when that *was gone* 95; 75; 156; - 23; 24; 25; 36; 66; 136; 183; 213; 221; 245; 302; 328; 335; 354; 354.

Grow, 9 ex. the Stakes... *being now grown* up to a thick Grove 214; He *was now grown* old 331; the Place *was grown* very familiar to me 200; 175; 179; 180; 246; 295; 330.

Improve, 2 ex. He could not tell to what Degree the Plantation *was improv'd*, but my Partner was grown exceeding rich 333; 337.

Jump. when the first *were jump'd* on Shore 297.

Land, 4 ex. He *was now landed*, and safe on Shore 52; I *was no sooner landed*, but... 102; 264; 290.

Lay. They *were laid* down to Sleep 301.

Pass, 6 ex. *being pass'd* two Rivers and come into the plain Country, we *found*... 346; In the relating what *is* already *past* of my Story, this will be the more easily believ'd, when... 103; When this (the settlement) *was pass'd*, the Man began to ask me, If... 336; 309; 346; 346.

Recover. I *was now recover'd* from my Surprize 210.

Return, 3 ex. as the Sea *was return'd* to its Smoothness, so... 9; In 8 Months, the Ship *being then return'd*, he sent me... 361; 9.

Run. Two Ships *were run* out to Sea 11.

Sail. Who would ha' suppos'd we *were sail'd* on to the southward 25.

Set. The three Men *were set* down under a great Tree 301.

Shoot. The stakes *were shot* out and grown with long Branches 123.

Sit. They had broke a Hole and *were sat* down 308.

Step. I *was no sooner stepp'd* down, but... 93.

Stoop. They *were stoop'd* down to untie the Bands 277.

Strike. After the Ship *was struck* on the Rock, they had sav'd themselves 264.

Turn. I could perceive that the Tide *was turn'd* and the Flood come on 225.

Especially noteworthy is the case when *be* is used with verbs of motion, even when they are followed by an object, or when the verb followed by a preposition forms a phrase equivalent to a transitive verb e. g.:

This is befallen us 15.

we were entred a vast great Forest 349.

we were pass'd the Height of the Mountains, without being incumbred with the Snow 346; we had some rough Way to pass yet... he bid us be easy, we should soon be past it all 346.

when I was got through the Strait 211; he was gotten over his Fright 274. — Further examples above.

In consideration of Defoe's pronounced predilection for the perfect infinitive (cf. Introduction p. 10) one is prepared to expect such phrases as the following:

It was my Business to be gone before the Tide began 66; Fowls who stood watching till I should be gone 136; 24; 36.

It blew so hard before they could be gotten a Quarter of their Way 282.

* * *

General observations concerning the examples.

In certain instances it is no easy matter to decide — even from an 18th century point of view — whether certain forms, e. g. *was broken* 49.28; *were driven* 48.34 are to be considered as an actual perfect tense = PE *had broken*, etc. or whether we have to do with a real passive.

* * *

The following examples, few as they are in comparison with those previously given, are the only ones where the auxiliary *have* is used with similar verbs:

Abate. the Wind *having abated* over Night, the Sea was calm 163.

Arrive. I *had arriv'd* to some Diversions 213.

Befall. The Miseries that *had befallen* me 103.

Break. some Bears *had broke* into the Village 358.

Come, 5 ex. We thought our Anchor *had come* home 10; a Contemplation, which often *had come* to my Thoughts 207; — I *had come* this Voyage only for a Trial 15; 123; 229.

Drive, see *row*.

Enter, 2 ex. An Offence which I *had not entred* into a Discussion of 201; 306.

Fall. many Europeans who *had fallen* into their Hands . . . 147.

Float. I saw the Ship *had floated* with the Tide and was driven on Shore 81.

Get (got), 5 ex. we *might have got* under the Lee of the Land 50; 19; 55.13, 23; 60. — *Get (gotten)* 2 ex. 80; 163 (cf. p. 78).

Go, 9 ex. I could perceive the Goats *had gone* in 171; I was inclin'd to *ha' gone* on Shoar 32; — I *had not gone* three Steps in, but . . . 210; when I *had gone* through this Work, I . . . 150; 151; 169; 194; 340; 357.

Jump. They *had jump'd* into a Canoe 278.

Land, 2 ex. The Place where I *had landed* before 58; 308.

Pass. I found I *had past* by the Place 167.

Perish. we expected we should all *have perish'd* 48.

Return. I was in tenfold more Horror upon Account of my *having returned* from them 12.

Row. After we *had row'd* or rather *driven* about a League 50.

Run, 3 ex. we *had no sooner run* out of the Cabbin . . . but 48; as her Forecastle *had run* on with great Violence, her Mainmast was . . . 226; 326.

Spread. The Vines *had spread* over the Trees 116.

Sail. I would not stop 'till I *had sail'd* five Days 26.

Spring, he cry'd we *had sprung* a Leak 12.

Strike. The Ship *having struck* upon the Sand 49.

Sink. he look'd so amaz'd that I thought he would *have sunk* down 250.

Wander. Savages, who *had wander'd* out to Sea 183.¹

*

In *hypothetical clauses*, where the condition is rejected, the use of *have* is practically the rule, both in the subordinate and principal clause:

if they *had come* down 191.

if God had... he would *have come* better Cloath'd 302.

Money, which if I *had escap'd*, would have lain safe 229.

to *have fallen* into the Hands of any of the Savages, had been as bad as to *have fallen* into... 28.

had I not gotten up, it would have been so 163.

had I used... I *had* certainly never *gone* away 46; *had* haizy Weather *interven'd*, I had been undone 165.

otherwise they would *have landed* at my Door 297.

had it returned, I... 52.

had not the man run... I had dy'd 338, etc. etc.

The following are the only cases where in all contemporary works perused by me *be* is used in a similar connection:

they only waited till I was gone... for as I walk'd off as if I *was gone*, they... RC 137.

if the Disease *was*, as I may say, only *frozen* up it would have returned to its usual Force, when... CG 235.

* * *

¹ As on pp. 95, 96 I have given in footnotes comparative examples illustrating the use of *to be* in other works than RC, I ought, in order to be consistent, in the same way to have given instances showing the use of *to have* in the same works. But this would have swelled unduly the bulk of my book, and moreover, for sufficiently obvious reasons, would be practically superfluous.

Only two of all the grammatical works examined by me devote any special attention to this question. — MAITTAIRE (p. 82 ff.) contents himself merely with mentioning the occurrence of 'some sorts of verbs which are declined partly Actively, partly Passively as *I have gone*, *I am gone*, *I have been gone*'. Some lines below he tells us that 'such forms of verbs as *I am entered the Town*, *I am passed the River* resemble what the Latins and Greeks call Deponent verbs, because they have indeed a Passive ending, but lay aside the Passive signification'.

LEDIARD, however, gives (p. 475) a somewhat more detailed account of the difference in use and signification of the auxiliaires *be* and *have* with 'Neutro-Passiva'. *Be*, he says, is used to denote 'dass die angedeutete Bewegung von einem Orte oder Zustande in einen anderen in der That geschehen sey, oder nun würklich werde geschehen seyn oder nicht: *I am arriv'd*, *I shall be arriv'd*; — dass man nach einer solchen gewissen, würklich geschehenen Bewegung fragt, e. g. *Is he arriv'd?* *Was he arriv'd?* *Will he be arriv'd?* oder eine solche würklich geschehene Bewegung presupponiert, e. g. *Do you know whether he were arriv'd?* In other cases 'wenn man indefinite ohne von dieser gewissen, würklich geschehenen Bewegung zu gedenken, redet', *have* is used 'wie bei den anderen Neutrismen'.

He then gives the following verbs which he considers as typical examples of those belonging to this category: 'arrive, become, befall, come, (decay),¹ depart, decease, enter, escape, fall, fly, go, grow, meet, pass, return, rise, run, stray, turn, vanish, (wither) und dergleichen'. — These statements of LEDIARD have merely been copied by ARNOLD p. 51.

JGR. despatches in a couple of lines the conjugation of the 'Neuter passives'. In his opinion expressions like *I am risen*, *I was walked out (exicram)* answer nearly to the reciprocal verbs in French(!).

In these statements of Lediard I think we find expressed the decided difference in conception between the linguistic usage

¹ The verbs in parenthesis are only found in GR. 1737.

of the 18th century and PE, especially as regards verbs of motion; in the 18th century the element of action falls into the background, and the language pays chief regard to the *state* arrived at. In PE the real perfect tense is formed with *to have* only. The participle of verbs of motion preceded by *to be* has now the character of an adjective, and denotes the situation in which the subject is placed at the conclusion of the action expressed by the verb rather than the action itself. — Cf. besides NED; Stofiel VW and Storm pp. 660, 937.

2. The periphrasis with *to do*.

In ME, and especially in Early MnE, the periphrastic forms with *to do*: *I did come*, *I did not come*, *did I come*, etc. occur very frequently without any perceptible difference of sense side by side with the simple forms of the principal verb: *I came*, *I came not*, *came I*. These alternate forms are merely employed as caprice, convenience, euphony or clearness of construction suggests (Sweet II. 88).¹ In PE, however, a decided distinction is as a rule drawn between these constructions. — In the language of Defoe and his contemporaries the PE usage was as yet far from settled.

I. In *affirmative* sentences, consequently, we very often find instances of *do* used without obviously adding anything to the meaning of the verb with which it is connected, e. g.:

Now tho' we thought that the Wind *did* a little *abate*, yet... we were... 49; All these Things, which I ought to have consider'd well of, and *did cast* up in my Thoughts afterwards, yet took up none of my Apprehensions at first

¹ For further particulars see esp. FRANZ p. 317; SWEET I.114, II.87; POUTSMA p. 78; DIETZE *Das umschreibende do in der Neuenglischen Prosa* (Diss. 1895); WRIGHT p. 297. and the papers of LUICK and SWOBODA in *Zs. für das Realschulwesen* XXIV p. 129 ff.

147; I *did* after some Pains taking *catch* a Parrot, for I knock'd it down with a Stick 128; the Bear, just as if he had understood . . . *did come* a little further 351; the Savages never attempted to go over to the Island afterwards; they were so terrified by those Men (for it seems they *did escape* the Sea) that . . . 288; at last I was obliged to shoot them and *did kill* a great many 175; What became of my Brother I never knew any more than my Father *did know* what was become of me 2; after I *did make* a just Improvement of these things, I went away and was no more sad 156; I let them stand till I found one of them, tho' it *did not crack*, *did melt* or *run* 142.

If he *did carry* them away, it must be in Irons 326; if *I did catch* any of them, it was by Traps 197; if *I did stir* with any Freedom, it was always to the East Part of the Island 229; he would say that if *I did take* this foolish Step, God would not bless me 5; 106; If *I did venture* abroad, it was not without looking round me 218.¹

¹ **PY** but still my Friend's Observation was just, and it *did appear* the People *did recover* faster, than they used to do 259; if I may speak my Opinion, I *do believe* that many hundreds of Infants perish'd in this Manner 136; many . . . sick *did not die*; but I think that while many *did die* . . . all those things were enough to deter any Man from a dangerous Mixture with the sick People 260; Men *did then no more die* by Tale and by Number . . . 'tis certain they *died by Heaps* 274; . . . some *did nothing*. However, in general, cautious People *did enter* into some Measures for sweetning their Houses 280; and those that fell into it (the Distemper), tho' they *did escape* with Life, yet they made bitter Complaints, that . . . 261; tho' it is true that a great many Clergymen *did shut up* their Churches . . . yet all *did not do so* 121; . . . and therefore when any English Vessel arriv'd, if they *did take* the Goods on Shore, they always caused the Bales to be opened 246; . . . none durst stop to make the least Inquiry or to administer Comfort to the poor Creatures. Some of the Ministers *did visit* the Sick at first, but it *was not to be done* 42.

TT Some hundreds of Prefaces wherein the Authors *do* at the very Beginning *address* the Reader 19; As the Grecians were wont to set up Trophies, so the Learned *do hang* out their Trophies too 235; In the

Note. In some of the above instances — esp. those in the conditional clauses — the use of the periphrastic form may possibly already have acquired the same character as it has in PE, viz. to lay greater emphasis on the verb. — For information concerning the PE usage of the unemphatic *do* in affirmative sentences see esp. the works given in note 1 p. 103.

* * *

2. In *negative* sentences, on the other hand, the language of Defoe, etc. often still retains several instances of the simple construction without the auxiliary *do* as, e. g. *I came not*, etc.¹

He *answer'd not* one Word, but look'd very grave and sad 268; I found a Kind of wild Pidgeons, who *built not* as Wood Pidgeons in a Tree, but rather in the Holes of the Rocks 89; I *car'd not* to drive a Nail for fear the Noise should be heard 208; I began to say that . . . I *cared not*, if I was never to remove 249; we *doubted not* but they would get up 356; they are Cannibals and *fail not* to murther all that fall into their Hands 128; he flew like one that *felt not* the Ground 273; I *forgot not* to lift up my Heart to Heaven 324; I *forgot not* to take the Money 330; It *gave us not* time hardly to say, O God 50; as for Food I yet *saw not* which Way to supply my self 61; I *saw not* the least Signal of any Thing 222; I explain'd why our Redeemer *took not* on him the Nature of Angels 260; I *went not* back to my Habitation 116.²

mean time I *do* here *make bold* to present your Highness with . . . 10.

For inst. from Sp. see DIETZE pp. 29, 33.

¹ In PE this practice still survives in certain stereotyped adverbial parenthetical phrases; cf. ESt. 24.71; KRÜGER III.425; POUTSMA p. 85.

² PY Hay was sold at 4 l. per Load in the Market just beyond White-Chapel . . . But that *affected not* the Poor 256; it certainly *answer'd not* their End, at least not in Proportion to the Injury it did 31; It *appear'd not* till it *seiz'd* the Heart 193; I *care not* to mention the Name, tho' I knew his Name too 96; we *desire not* to put your People into any fear of us 159; I *doubt not* but there were many that . . . 264; The citizens *forgot not* to contribute to the Relief of the Poor 59; People have it when they *know it not* 221, 225 etc.; they *knew not* what to do 155, etc.,

The periphrastic form is, however, by far the commonest:

I did not care to go 28; 111; 327; *we did not design to* ... 36; *he did not doubt but* ... 361; *he did not fly* 33; *they did not hear* 36; *which I did not see* 55; 144; *I did not take nor did I chew* 111; *Fowls which I did not understand* 84, etc. etc.

The verb *to know* forms the single exception to this usage, as with this verb the simple forms are by far the most frequent. This is especially the case when *know* is preceded or

etc.; *it matter'd not* from whence it come 1; *I slept not* that Night 83; *People who valued not* who they injur'd 84 — the *People durst not* go 164.

CG A thousand occasions that *I care not* to repeat 157; the reasons why they can not, or *care not* to suckle their own children 78; ... the merit too must remain But if the vertue *descends not* with the titles, the man is but the shaddow of a gentleman 24; *I doubt not* but we shall soon find it out 86; *I kno' not* where 38, etc.; whether it be mother wit or clergy, *it matters not* 42; *it understands not* the nature of the things 110.

TT It is to be lamented tho' *I know not* how 152; They send to forrage among Friends and Enemies *it matters not* 138; they seldom fail of missing the mark if they *stay not* for a second 90.

Sw. Let. If *I mistake* you not 54.

Ta. He *doubted not* but (Steele) 204.2; There is, *I know not* what Malignity in the Minds 202.4.

Sp. *Answer me not* concluded the Prince Smiling 76.1. *I doubt not* but he will be in the Conquest 40.10; the News will, *I doubt not*, be ... 452.12; who were the first, *I know not* 401.1; If... *I question not* but 73.6; 517.23; *I question not* but ... 317.5. (Cf. ARNOLD p. 87; 'Nach den Verbis dubitandi wird der Conjunctio *that* durch *but* ausgedruckt, als *I doubt not* but etc.; *he questions not but*'). *Trust not* a Man, who... (in poetry) 198.4. — For additional inst. see DIETZE p. 47 ff.

Ev. why should I publish that he *deserves not* that honour II.261; *I doubt not* but you may... 1.187; *I know not* how... 1.82; How soon I recovered, *I know not* II.99, etc.; *I look not* forward but to misery and despair II.159; *reprobate not* your child though you have reprobad its mother III.132; *Reverse not* the law of nature III.224.

followed by an indirect interrogative sentence (cf. my statistics page 108):

I saw Fowls, but *knew not* their Kinds 61 — what kind of one to make I *knew not* 85 — I *knew not* how it came there 91; I *knew not* whither I should steer 23; the Mouth of a little River, I *knew not* what 26 (cf. the French 'je ne sais quoi').¹

*

In sentences with inverted word-order introduced by *neither*, *nor*, the periphrasis is practically the rule. (For PE use see Poutsma p. 80 ff.). Examples:

I *knew not*, *neither did* I so much as *consider* whither . . . 23; *neither did* I *know* how . . . 85; *neither did* I *see* any Prospect 53 — *nor did* I *know* what to do 144; *nor did* I *see* any Possibility of . . . 164; *nor did* Men always *square* their Dealings by . . . 289; *nor did* I *take* the Pains 214, etc. etc.

Only in one single instance have I found the simple form in a sentence of this description:

neither knew I how to weave it, or spin it 144.

*

With *auxiliaries*, and esp. the verbs *dare* and *need*, periphrasis never occurs (For PE use see Poutsma p. 87 ff.):

I *durst not* sleep 80; if he *durst not* leave 327, etc; *neither durst* I stir from the Posture 59.

I *need not* repeat 236; we found that we *need not* take such Pains 29; I *needed not* hunt any more 197.

In the *negative imperative* of *to be*, however, the periphrastic form is the only one occurring:

do not be frightened 273.

¹ For further particulars, esp. as to *I know not*, etc. see ESt. 9.235; STORM p. 490; SWEET II.91.

In order to establish the relation between simple and periphrastic forms in negative sentences, I have perused the first 110 pages of RC, where I found no less than *twenty* instances of the negative *know* used without *do* (pp. 15, 16, 21, 23, 26, 27, 29, 32, 50, 58, 60, 61, 61, 84, 85, 91, 101, 106, 109), while the periphrastic form only occurs *three* times (pp. 5, 12, 29). As the corresponding figures for other verbs (auxiliaries and sentences with inverted word-order not included) are *four* (pp. 50, 61, 89, 98) and *eighteen* respectively (pp. 5, 6, 17, 19, 28, 33, 34, 35, 36, 36, 52, 54, 55, 68, 70, 84, 102, 103) it is obvious that Dietze's statements p. 46, that Defoe in his '*Robinson*' out of 46 instances employs the simple form no less than 20 times (43.5 %) are quite wrong.

* * *

3. As regards *interrogative* sentences, the language of RC and other contemporary works of the same character does not seem to deviate essentially from PE:

Dost thou ask, What I have done 109; how did I come here 169; d'ye see what charming Weather 'tis now 9; how do I know what... 202 — Did not you come Eleven of you... 72; do not you wish 266, etc. etc.

The following are the only instances found in RC:

How *came* you to be taken 253.27, 30; what *matters* it if... 133.¹

¹ **PY** How *came* it to stop so long 235; *Sayest thou so, said I* 126.

CG But harke ye, Sir, said I (Defoe) how *come* you to understand Latin 188; how *comes* a fool to convey strong capascities 108; *Say you so* nephew, said I (Defoe) 196.

PC How *came* you upon that Scratch 38.4; how *came* your ladyship to go to that puppet-show 397; 456; How *does* your lady unknown 434; how *does* your neighbour 441; Tom, what *say* you to that 445.

Ev. Pray, how *goes* time III.17; What *say you* to a strole in the garden III.18; What *signifies* asking them girls I.190. (c); Lord, what *signifies* that (Br.) II.110.

Similar constructions, which seem to have been very common in the spoken language of the time — see the examples given in the note p. 108 — occasionally survive in present colloquial English, but are either felt as archaic or as influenced by the dialects. Cf. notes pp. 103, 105.

* * *

As I suggested above, it may often be very difficult to determine whether in affirmative sentences *do* was used to intensify the sense of the verb, or not. — The first grammarian to explicitly mention the emphatic use of *do* is WALLIS who says on p. 106: '*Do* et *did* indicant emphatice tempus praesens et imperfectum, *I burn*, vel (emphatice) *I do burn* etc'. This statement we afterwards find either only translated or more or less remodelled and explained by all the grammarians of the 18th cent. On the other hand we also very often find merely such alternative examples as *I burn* — *I do burn*, etc. (GREENWOOD, JONES p. 41) given without any information whatever, as to whether there is any difference in emphasis intended, or not. — Besides mentioning the 'emphatic' use of *do*, S. JOHNSON calls attention to this 'superfluous' use of *do* which, he says, 'is considered as a vicious mode of speech'.

The periphrasis with *do* in negative sentences is first mentioned by MIÈGE (p. 89) who declares it to be the rule. — BRIGHTLAND (p. 112), dealing with the word-order in a question, merely gives a couple of alternative examples '*Does Stephen write?*; *burn I? burnst thou?* or *dost thou burn?*' — GREENWOOD does the same in a note 'on the placing of *not*' (merely copied from Wallis): *It burned not, it did not burn, it burned me not*. In another connection, however, he tells us more decidedly 'that we make use of the Helping verb *do*, especially with the Adverb *not*, as *I do not burn, I did not do it*'. — About its use in interrogative sentences he does not give us any views of his own.

In ARNOLD (p. 86) we certainly find the following examples: '*I write — I write not, Read you?* or *do you read?*'

but on pp. (41 and) 88 he declares that 'Wenn man im Presenti oder Imperfecto fraget oder verneinet so wird solches durch . . . *do* ausgedruckt: *Do not I say it?*, *he doth not mind it*; *Did I know that?* — *how d'ye do*' (p. 41).

While JOHNSON establishes that the periphrastic form is the rule in interrogative sentences, and in the 'imperative prohibitory', he is a little more cautious in his utterances as to its use in negative sentences: 'by custom at least', he says, 'this appears more easy than the other (simple) form'. — WARD'S statements in all respects agree with those of PE grammarians.

Concerning the use of *do* with auxiliaries the 18th century grammars I have examined give no information.

VII. The *adjectival adverb*.

The distinctions drawn between the *adjectival adverb* and the adverbs in *ly* in present day English both by the best authors and the grammarians are in many respects much finer than a couple of centuries ago.¹

Though in some cases the flat adverb is still the only one used in standard English, a great many of the instances, esp. as regards the intensives, found in the best authors of the 17th² and 18th cent. are no longer used in the

¹ For information as to the origin and development of these forms see KOCH II.297; MÄTZNER II.290; SWEET 428; EARLE: *Engl. Prose* 263, *Engl. Phil.* 408; KRÜGER II.60 ff., III.125 ff.; ABBOTT 17; FRANZ 74 and FR. SYNT. 101, and in the special treatises by BECKMAN, BORST and STOFFEL. — Besides in these works the usage of the flat adverb in modern colloquial, vulgar, and dialectal English is more fully treated in STORM 722, 727 ff., where references to a great number of additional grammars are to be found; 872, 900—902 (Amer. Engl.); FR. DIAL. 231; WRIGHT 298; *Anglia* 7.258 (Negro-Engl.).

² For this see especially ABBOTT 17; FRANZ 74; VODOZ 97.

higher strata of the language, having, as is often the case with many of the linguistic phenomena adduced in this treatise, degenerated into the lower phases: the colloquial, vulgar and dialectical language. They still survive, especially in the two last mentioned cases, with at the very least the same vitality as in the days of Shakespeare, and Defoe, the flat intensive being there almost the only one occurring even in connection with a verb-form (Borst p. 24).

* * *

The statements of the grammarians on this point are very scanty, being no doubt due to their considering them as quite good and correct English.

From the early part of the century LEDIARD (p. 498) is the only one who mentions the existence of the flat adverb, on the whole. He divides the adverbs into three classes: '1. Radices: *here* — 2. Derivata mit Zusetzung der Endung *-ly*: *wisely* — 3. Adverbia per Accidens, die nur zufälliger Weise Adverbia werden; diese sind eigentlich adjektiva, die in ihren wesentlichen Buchstaben bisweilen adverbaliter gebraucht werden (e. g. I am mighty hungry, I have shewn you clear the contrary').

Even by the latter part of the 18th century the use of the flat intensive seems to have already been in a fair way to loose its former popularity in standard English. This may also be gathered from the following statement of PEGGE: 'The best of us generally use the adjective for the adverb, where there is any degree of comparison to be expressed: How *extreme* cold the weather is'. (In the edition 1843—44 this note is added: 'Quite out of use now').

A. Used as an intensive.

1. Qualifying an adjective.

In the works of the classical authors at the beginning of the 18th cent. and especially in Defoe, the use of the flat

adverb as intensifying a following adjectival word or an adverb was in my opinion far commoner than the corresponding inflectional form, which, concerning RC at least, will be evident from the comparative occurrences of the two different forms:

with a great deal of Pains, and *awkward tedious* stitching I made 270.28; a *charming fine* Evening follow'd 8.23; when I saw them *clear red* I let them stand in that Heat about 5 or 6 Hours 142.31; The Bear comes after him taking *Devilish long* Strides 350.10; the Sea went *dreadful high* 49.35; it rain'd *exceeding hard* 83.1; the Weather being *exceeding hot* 130.27; my Partner was grown *exceeding Rich* 333.9; 40.25; 85.18; 88.11, etc., 10 ex.

Exceeding — the fashionable intensive for excellence at the beginning of the 18th century — enjoyed then the same amount of popularity as *vastly* in the middle of the century and *awfully* in PE. (See Borst pp. 36, 124, 158; cf. Storm p. 730). — Side by side with *exceeding*, but far less in favour, stand *extreme*, *excellent* and *excessive*:

The Grapes were *excellent good* 120.5; The Bottles held two Pound of *excellent good* Tobacco 325.15; Negroes were bought, and those *excessive dear* 44.17; the Weather being *excessive hot* 83.28; 92.33; the Weather being *extreme hot* 216.4; I saw a most *frightful old* He-Goat 191.8.

Used as an intensive to an adjective (adverb), etc. *mighty* is, as far as I can see, the only occurring form throughout the 18th century.¹

I began to be *mighty impatient* 215.26; Well, says he, *mighty affectionately* 259.24; he was *mighty well pleas'd* 246.30, etc., 7 ex.

a *monstrous great* one 31.36; growing so *monstrous thick* 191.8; I saw *perfect green* Barley 90.35; it was a *terrible*

¹ The following passage is interesting to show how strictly the distinction was maintained even in the 17th cent.: 'I am *mighty* pleased with it and think it *mighty witty*' < PEPYS'S DIARY (see STORM p. 731).

great Lyon 30.31; I was a tollerable good Taylor 246.27; the Weather was so violent hot 158.11; we saw vast great Creatures come down to the Shoar 27.12; a vast monstrous One (Bear) it was 349.12: we were entred a vast great Forest 349.35.¹

¹ PY The price was exceeding dear 254; the Distress was so exceeding great 123; it was said to be exceeding rich 108; they were extraordinary long affected with it 285; talking mighty eagerly to them 29.

CG so exceeding great 152; so exceeding pleasant 154; an extraordinary good name 268; a mighty antient family 122.

Further ex. from Defoe: confounded mad; made them roast a piece of venison admirable well (NED).

TT Peter was become exceeding rich 102; exceeding curios 162 we are extream unwilling 45; to which those are extream subject 238; a wonderful strong Breath 103; It shall pass for wondrous Deep 217.

Sw. Let. the king must be excessive generous 47; I had a terrible hot journey 10.

Ta. extream hot 220.2; he look'd plaguy sowl at me (STEELE) 25.7.

Sp. the Walk looks exceeding solemn 110.2; exceeding sweet 150.2; though excessive ignorant he has found a way 145.2; he was extream pcor 45.4.6.

Ev. they must have a devilish good conceit of themselves I.187 (c); I must tell you a most excellent good joke I.188 (c); Do you think him handsome? Some people reckon him to have a good pretty person, but I think he's monstrous ugly II.72 (Miss P); As to Moll she is well enough but nothing extraordinary; as to the other, she is good white and red I.196(c); You are mighty fond of new acquaintance I.75 (c); You have a monstrous good stare (an unknown woman at a ball) II.197; My Lord drove so monstrous fast, said Lady Louisa III.16; I am monstrous glad III.83; monstrous hot III.176 (Ly. L); they agreed, that it was monstrous dear I.161.

The last reference being simply a quotation of the Misses Branghton's words, occurring in a letter from the heroine of the novel, is printed in italics, whereby, no doubt the author wanted to indicate its vulgar or at least colloquial character (cf. *catched* p. 86).

They're mortal dear I.187 (c); I don't know what I had done, so particular bad II.43 (D); half of 'em are plaguy ugly I.188; II.9 (c); 'twas plaguy unlucky II.13 (c). —

With the exception of a couple of forms (*monstrously*, *vastly*, see below) the above quoted flat forms *dreadful*, *excessive*, *mighty*, etc. are the only ones occurring as intensives before adjectives and adverbs in RC. —

BORST's statement (p. 58) 'Im 18. Jahrh. finden sich dann auch in dieser Stellung beide Formen neben einander (so bei Defoe und noch bei Miss Burney 1778)' is based as far as Defoe is concerned, on the example 'it rained *exceedingly hard*' found on p. 28 in the edition (Routledge) he has used. Unfortunately this form does *not* occur in RC, the form being *exceeding* as usual (see above ex. 83.1). Another similar error, due to his using a modern reprint, which are in no respect trustworthy from a linguistic point of view (cf. p. XXXVI) is found on p. 60: '*excessively hot* (83.28) instead of *excessive hot*. His 'quotation' from Defoe (p. 133 'wonderfully') is also wrong (see below ex. 319.18). His other 'quotations' I have not found it necessary to verify.

*

The following are the only passages I have come across where the inflectional adverb occurs in RC the same as in PE:

admirably well I.43.19; I was most *inexpressibly sick* 7.17; *inexpressibly dreadful* 102.17; I was *meerly* thoughtless

As will be seen from these examples the flat intensive is only used by very careless or vulgarly speaking persons.

*

In the speech of the educated personages, on the other hand, only the inflectional form occurs, e. g.:

he was so *exceedingly officious* I.183; your Lordship is *extremely good* II.147; your constitution is *infinitely delicate* III.28; *wonderfully ingenuous* I.192.

Only twice have I come across instances of the flat adv.: 'an *exceeding good* concert I.182. [Cf. *exceedingly officious* only next page]. It is something *mighty terrific* in becoming a countess' III.206.

For further ex. chiefly out of the classical authors of the 18th cent. see BECKMAN, BORST, FRANZ (EST. 18) and STORM in works and places referred to above, and last but not least NED.

of a God, acted like a meer Brute, and by the Dictates of common Sense only, and indeed hardly that 103.34; *monstrously heavy* 350.35; *severely cold* 344.24; a *severely cold* (B *severe cold*) Season 360.11; I was *sincerely thankful* 233.10; *strangely hard* 142.8; *vastly big* 160.37; *wonderfully well* 319.18.¹

2. Qualifying a past participle.

In this connection the inflectional adverb is practically the only one occurring:

I was *dreadfully frighted* 168.21; I was *exceedingly diverted* with this journey 128.25; I *excessively fatigu'd* 59.25; I was *heartily star'd* 93.19; I was *perfectly astonish'd* 90.32; my Thoughts were *sadly disturb'd* 109.9; I was *terribly surpriz'd* 215.4; a Knife, which he was *wonderfully delighted* with 263.15, etc, etc.²

Only in the subsequent few cases have I found examples of the flat adverb, used as a verb intensive, completely differing from PE usage:

. . . look back upon a *dreadful mis-spent Life* 108.32; I made a *formal fram'd Door-Case* 247.10; I was *sore put* to it for Neccesaries 284.34.³

¹ **CG** I have been *exceedingly ill* (in Defoe's letter) X. — This is the only instance of *exceedingly*, used as an adjective intensive, found by me in Defoe.

² **CS** he was *mightily pleas'd* 44.

PY the Plague was *exceedingly advanced* 144; the Gentlemen were *exceedingly pleas'd* 191;

TT a Person *exceedingly disposed* to run away 182; the Bulls were *extremely vitiated* 98; the Opinions were *extremely misrepresented* 158.

Sp. *excessirely ill-bred* 145.5; *extremely pleas'd* 202.2; he is *mightily concerned* 140.2.

³ **CG** he was never satisfied with knowing and never *exceeding* delighted also in the success 208; — **RC II.** I was most *sensible touch'd* 16

B. Used as a purely adverbial adjunct.

In the early MnE period, the 16th and also, although to a far smaller extent, e. g. in Shakespeare, in the 17th cent.¹ the flat adverb, of whatever origin, could also be used as a purely adverbial adjunct. In the beginning of the 18th cent., however, such expressions as: *give bountiful, ample beloved, gentle tell me* (see Franz p. 75) were probably considered as no longer correct. Amongst other things this will be seen from the fact that Rowe (cf. p. 46) in his edition of Shakespeare alters them into the corresponding inflectional form. Examples:

rapid Currents which *ran constantly* on both Sides 224.27; I was *earnestly begging* 112.35; The Ship was *taken effectually* 323.7; this *refresh'd me exceedingly* 84.21; I *liv'd happily* 169.36; the Wind *rose hastily* 66.27; It wou'd have *crusht it involuntarily*, if . . . 222.37; my Cloaths began to *decay too mightily* 158.1; Vessels, which I *wanted sorely* 141.3, etc.

In a great number of other cases, however, the usage was not quite settled, especially when the adverb originally had been an adjective, used in the neutral singular, or in cases where the adverb is only a descendant of an OE adverb in -e which in a later state of development of the language lost its original adverbial suffix and became identical in form with the adjective. — In many cases it is often very difficult to decide if the form in question is to be conceived as an adjunct to the subject (object), or to the verb of the sentence.

While *according* is still used in conjunction with a following *to* or *as*, e. g.: — *according as the wind blew this current came nearer* 178.18 — *according* alone is now obsolete:

— — —
¹ Numerous quotations esp. in ABBOTT 17; FRANZ 75; STORM 727 ff.
 — For PE use see STORM 732; KRÜGER II.60, III.125.

I would kill that Bird; *according* I fir'd 250.30; if I arrived I should make some Acquaintance; and *according* I prepair'd to go for England 341.17.

In the last example B has *accordingly*, which is far and away the most usual form (11 ex.):

I *accordingly* set them at Liberty 328.4; I learn'd to divide them so, as to provide for them *accordingly* 122.19.

Preceded by a comparative + *than*, *common*, *ordinary*, *usual* are the only forms occurring in RC:

the Hawk had no Talons more than *common* 61.22; I thought her a little pleasanter than *ordinary* 5.29; 17.20; 122.5; I had no Pain more than *ordinary* 231.34, 309.31 lying longer than *usual* 21.18. — But 'he does not *usually* attempt them' 348.24.

I finish'd them very *compleat* making a small Stay, and a Sail to it 271.3; I saw how plainly . . . how *easy*, how comfortably he had liv'd 8.9; the Ship might ride as *easy* as possible 10.23; they were *easily* perswaded 314.34; I might very *easily* bring my Boat about the Island 178.31; my Head run *mightily* upon the Thought of getting . . . 147.9; I was nothing *near* so anxious 70.13; I run out *near* a League 24.34; many Things were either quite gone or *near* spent 156.36; he talk'd so articulately and *plain* 213.14 (cf. laughing *loud* 352.30); we could see them *plainly* 312.7; having stow'd my Boat very *safe* I went on Shore 167.30; there was *scarce* any Condition 77.19; I could *scarce* ha' fail'd 45.14; *scarce* credible 89.1, etc.

The forms *nearly*, *scarcely* commonly used in present standard English were evidently very scarce in 18th century literature. In all the works examined by me there is, as fas as I can see, not a single example of them; cf. Beckman.

he was easily perswaded to joyn very *sincere* with us 314.34 (B has *sincerely*); I slept very *sound* 323.17; I slept *soundly*

189.10, 81.20; (cf. I slept very *quietly* 64.1); (we) living very *sparing* on our Provisions 32.12; I did it then very *sparingly* 95.18; I contented my self to use it more *sparingly* 122.13; he swam so *strong* after the Boat 25.6; my Teeth and my Head wou'd set against one another so *strong*, that . . . 223.1; For *sure* never Man run like him 285.15; *Sure* we are all made by some secret Power who form'd the Earth 108.1.¹

¹ PY the shrieks were so *frequent* to be heard 20; the Fright was not *near* so great 21, etc.; more Victuals than *ordinary* 106; 259; more than *ordinarily* 188, 281. (Cf: *ordinarily* it was so 200); *scarce* credible 96, 266, etc.; the Plague was *scarce* begun 281, etc.;

CG the steward writes very *fine* and spells well too 130; he danc'd so *fine* . . . talk'd so *finely* 190; He speaks French as *fluent* as the English 200; *near* 60000 worth of timber 260; there's *scarce* one in five of them 54; they are *scarce* good for interpreters 201.

RED more than was *ordinarily* known 17.

SW. LET. *Sure* you stretch ye walk when you talk of 5000 foot 12.

TA. they bark more than *ordinary* 73.4; a man bigger than *ordinary* 243.1; I recovered so *quick* and jumped so *nimbly* 93.7 Secondhand Vice *sure* of all is the most nauseous 27.3.

SP. if a Woman does but know that her Husband can spare six Shillings a Week *extraordinary*, she will . . . 246.3; the words are *wrong* spelt 153.3.

EV. those a'n't half so *near* related to you I.142 (Miss P); I have *scarce* made any use of her II.6 (c); a voice *scarce* audible II.256; III.80, etc.; I never heard any body talk so *shocking* III.294 (Ly. L). [Cf: don't talk so *shockingly* III.31 (Ly. L)].

Index.

A, an (article) 28—31.
abidd, abode 75, 81.
according-ly 116, 117.
acquaintance-s 36.
ad infinitum 16.
administred 25.
admirably 113, 114.
altered 25.
anacolutha 8.
and who, and which 7.
an't 27, 64.
archaism of language 18.
archaisms from the Bible 14.
arose (pret.) 72, 73.
arose, arisen 75, 81.
as—so 8.
awak'd, awoke 81, 90, 91.
awfully 112.
awkward (adv.) 112.
Backwarder 43.
bad, bid (pret.) 72—74.
ball-s 36.
barco-longo 17.
bare, bore 67, 68.
barrels 34.
be, auxiliary 94—103.
beared 91.
beat-en 80—82.
beautifullest 43.
become (pret.) 72, 73.
becomed 92.
becomingest 43.
began, begun (pret.) 68—71.
began, begun (pple.) 75, 76, 80.
begat (pret.) 66, 67.
begat (pple.) 75.
begot-ten 66, 81.
beseeched, besought 87.
bespoke (pple.) 77.
bid-den 79, 81, 82.
bisket 37.
bit-ten 76, 77, 80, 81.
bitterest 42.
blackning 25.
blew, blow'd, blown 75, 88, 91.
beat 39.
bode (pret.) 81.
bore, born 81, 82.
borrowed words 16, 17.
brake, broke 67, 68.
brightn'd 25.
broke-n 77—81.
builded, built 83—86.
bullet-s 35—37.
burnt 84—86.
bushel-s 32, 34.
Came, come (pret.) 70, 72—75.
candle-s 35, 37.
cannon 36, 37.
can't 26.
cat 39.
catcht, caught 85—87.
chalder-s 32.
characteristic phrases 9.
charming (adv.) 112.
chid-den 80—82.
choosed 91.
chose-n 77, 80, 81.
christned 25.
Classical quotations 13—16.

clave 67, 68.
 clear (adv.) 112.
 clove 81.
 clung (pret.) 69, 71.
 comed 92.
 common (adv.) 117.
 comparison of adj. 41—45.
 compleat (adv.) 117.
 considring 25.
 constantly 116.
 coup de grace 17.
 crow'd 91.
Day-s 32, 34.
 deer 35.
 delivred, delivring 25.
 desp'rate 25.
 devilish (adv.) 112, 113.
 difficultest 42.
 diffrent 25.
 digged, dug 88, 91.
 disagreeablest 43.
 discovred 25.
 dismallest 42.
 do, periphrasis with 103—110.
 dog 39.
 don't 26.
 doth 61, 62.
 double comparison 45—47.
 dozen 34.
 drank, drunk (pret.) 69—71.
 drank, drunk-en (pple.) 75—77,
 80—82.
 drave, drove 67, 68, 74.
 draw'd, drawn 91.
 dreadful-ly 112—115.
 dream'd 83—86.
 drew (pret.) 78, 91.
 drove, driven 80—82.
 Dutch words 17.
 dwelt 84—86.
 d'ye, d'you 26.
 Earnestly 115.
 easy, easily 117.
 eat-en 76, 78, 80—82.
 effectually 116.
 eleganter 43.
 'em 55, 56.
 encountred 25.
 encumbr'd 25.
 endeavrd 25.
 engendring 25.
 enlightned 25.
 enterance, entrance 24.
 entred, entring 24, 25.
 Espagnole 17.
 exceeding-ly 112—116.
 excellent (adv.) 112—114.
 excessive-ly 112—114.
 extraordinary (adv.) 113, 118.
 extream-ly 113—115.
 Fallen 80.
 fastned 24.
 fathom-s 32, 35.
 favrites 25.
 fell (pple.) 76, 83.
 fine-ly 118.
 fish 35.
 flattery 25.
 fluent (adv.) 118.
 flung (pple.) 69, 70.
 foot 32, 33, 35.
 forbad, forbid (pret.) 72, 73.
 forbid-den 77, 78.
 Foreign elements 12—17.
 forgat 67.
 forgot-ten 76, 77, 79, 81.
 formal (adv.) 115.
 forsook, forsaken 76, 80, 82.
 French words 16, 17.
 frequent (adv.) 118.
 freshning 24.
 frightful (adv.) 112.
 furlongs 34.
 Gallons 34.
 gat, got 66—68.
 gave, give (pret.) 72, 74.
 gender 10, 39.
 generalissimo 17.
 Germanic words as contrasted to
 Romanic words 12, 13.

given 74, 80.
 goat 39.
 good (adv.) 113.
 got-ten 76—79, 81.
 grown 80.
Ha', han't 64, 65.
 handsomest 42.
 hang'd, hung 90, 91.
 happily 116.
 hardned 24.
 hardned-est 42.
 harkee 49, 53.
 hastily 116.
 hath 61, 62.
 have, auxiliary 94—103.
 heartily 115.
 heartned 24.
 hem (them) 55.
 hid-den 76, 77, 80, 81.
 hindred 25.
 historical present 10, 60.
 hit (pple.) 80.
 honester, honestest 42, 43.
 horridest 42.
 horse 39.
 hour-s 32, 34.
I'll 26.
 ill-bredest 43.
 incumbred 24.
 impertinentest 46.
 impudentest 43, 46.
 in a word 7.
 incumbr'd, incumbring 25.
 indifferent 26.
 inexpressibly 114.
 infinitely 114.
 ingenio 17.
 intrest 24, 25.
 involuntarily 116.
 I say 7.
 Italian words 17,
 it's 26.
Kid 40.
 knaw'n 91.
 kneel'd 83, 84.
 knew 91.
 knowed 92.
Lade, laded, laden 82, 89, 90.
 Latin words 16.
 leagues 34.
 learn'd, learnt 83—86.
 lengthning 25.
 lessning 25.
lib'rall 25.
 listned, listning 24, 25.
 loaded, loaden 88—91.
 long sentences 6—9.
 lookee 49, 53.
 loud (adv.) 117.
lyon 39.
Main-mast 39.
 mastr'd 25.
 mean'd, meant 84—86.
 meerly 114.
 memento 16.
 memorandum 16.
 mighty, mightily 112, 114, 116,
 117.
 mile-s 32, 35.
 ministring 25.
 minutes 34.
 miserablest 42, 43, 46.
 mistook, mistaken 75—77.
 moderate 25.
 moistned 25.
 monstrous, monstruous 24.
 monstrous-ly 112—115.
 months 34.
 more politer, most miserablest,
 etc. 45—47.
 mortal (adv.) 113.
 mow'd 90.
 mystry 25.
Near-ly 117, 118.
 Negroe English 17.
 nimbly 118.
 numbred 24.
 numerals 47.
 Oar-s 35, 37.
 offred 25.

oftner 24, 25.
 ordinariest 42.
 ordinary, ordinarily 117, 118.
 ord'r'd 25.
 orthography 22, 23, 84, 85.
 other-s 58, 59.
 ounces 34.
 overtaken 76.
 overthrown 80.
Padres 17.
 pair 34, 35.
 parrot 39, 40.
 particular (adv.) 113.
 perfect infin. 10.
 perfect-ly 112, 115.
 personal gender in regard to
 animals and things 10, 39.
 pistol-s 35, 37.
 plaguy (adv.) 113.
 plain-ly 117.
 pleasanter, pleasantest 42, 43.
 pound-s 32—35.
 prithee 49, 50.
 profounder, profoundest 43.
 properest 43.
 provision-s 36, 38.
 provokinger, provokingest 46.
Quick (adv.) 118.
 quietly 117.
Ran (pple.) 75.
 ran, run (pret.) 68—71.
 rang, rung (pret.) 70.
 raught, reached 87.
 recovred, recovering 25.
 registered 24.
 remembred, remembering 24, 25.
 rendred 24, 25.
 rendrings 25.
 revrence 25.
 rid, rode (pret.) 72—75, 81.
 rid-den 78, 79, 81, 82.
 rigider 43.
 ris, ris'd (pret.) 90.
 rise, rose (pret.) 72—75, 81.
 rode (pple.) 76.
 rose, risen 75, 76, 81, 83.
 rot-ten 80, 81.
 runn'd 92.
 rusk 37.
-S, ending of first sing. 60, 61.
 sadly 115.
 safe (adv.) 117.
 sang, sung (pret.) 60, 70, 72, 73.
 sank, sunk (pret.) 69—71.
 sat, sitten 82.
 sate, sit (pret.) 74.
 saw, see (pret.) 72—74.
 says I, etc. 10, 60.
 scarce-ly 117, 118.
 Seignior Inglese 17.
 sensible (adv.) 115.
 severe-ly 115.
 shaked 90.
 share (pret.) 67, 68.
 sheared 91, 92.
 sheep 35.
 shew'd 90, 92.
 shilling-s 32, 35.
 shine-d 90, 92.
 ship 39.
 shocking-ly 118.
 shone 81.
 shook, shaken 75, 76, 79, 81,
 82.
 shookeed 92.
 shore 81.
 shore (pret.), shorn (pple.) 92.
 shortned 24, 25.
 shot 35—37.
 shot-ten 80, 81.
 shrank, shrunk (pret.) 69—71.
 shrivled 25.
 sincere-ly 115, 117.
 sit-ten 74.
 slank (pret.) 71.
 slid (pple.) 77.
 slung (pret.) 69—71.
 smell'd, smelt 83—86.
 smitt (pret.) 75.
 smote, smit-ten 81, 82.

snow'd 91.
 sod-den 81, 82.
 softned 25.
 sore-ly 115, 116.
 sought 87.
 sound-ly 117.
 sow'd, sow'n 90.
 spake, spoke 66—68.
 span, spun (pret.) 69—71.
 Spanish words 17.
 sparing-ly 118.
 spat, spitt'en 81.
 spinned 91.
 spoil'd, spoilt 83, 86.
 spoke-n 77, 78, 80, 82.
 sprang, spong, sprung (pret.)
 69—71.
 squandring 25.
 stank, stunk (pret.) 70, 71.
 stole-n 77, 78, 81.
 stood 81.
 story 32, 33.
 straitned 24.
 strangely 115.
 streightned 25.
 strive 92.
 strode, stridden 82.
 strong (adv.) 118.
 strook, stricken, struck 75, 80—
 82.
 strook, struck (pret.) 66, 67,
 70.
 strove 81.
 stuck 70.
 stung 70, 71.
 suffr'd 25.
 sunk-en 80, 82.
 suprisingest 43.
 sure (adv.) 118.
 swam, swom, swum (pret.) 69—
 71.
 swang, swung (pret.) 70.
 sware, swore 66—68.
 swell'd, swollen 90, 91.
 swimm'd 91.
 swore, sworn 81.
 Tare 67, 68.
 tattred 25.
 taught, teached 87.
 terra firma 16.
 terrible, terribly 112, 113, 115.
 -th, ending of third sing. 61—64.
 thankee 49, 53.
 that's 26.
 them 55—57.
 there's 26.
 thickned 24.
 thou, thee, thy, etc. 48—50.
 threatned, threatnring 25.
 thrive, thrived, throve 75, 81,
 90—92.
 throve, thriven 81.
 throw'd 91.
 thrown 80.
 thundring 25.
 tiresomest 43.
 'tis 26.
 tollerable (adv.) 113.
 took, taken 75, 76, 81—83, 90.
 tooked 92.
 tore, torn 77, 81.
 tortoise 38.
 t'other, the t'other 56—58.
 trod-den 77, 80, 81.
 tun-s 32, 35.
 turtle-s 38, 39.
 'twas 26.
 'twill 26.
 'twould 26.
 'Um ('em) 55.
 undertaken 76, 77.
 unencumbr'd 25.
 unhappiest 42.
 unluckiest 43.
 unthinkingest 43.
 usual-ly 117.
 Vast, vastly 113, 115.
 ventrous, venturous 24.
 vigorous 25.
 violent (adv.) 112.

Wak'd, woke 81, 90, 91.
wakned 24.
wan, won (pret.) 70, 71.
wandred, wandring 24, 25.
wa'n't 93.
ware, wore (pret.) 66—68.
wast 92, 93.
watring 25.
weakning 25.
weared 91.
weaved, wove-n 90—92.
week 32.
we'll 26.
wert 92, 93.
who, for 'whom' 10.
who's 26.
wickedest 43.

wonderfuller 43.
wonderful-ly 113—115.
wondred, wondring 24, 25.
wondrous (adv.) 113.
won't 26, 65.
wore, worn 80, 81.
worked, wrought 86, 87.
worser 46.
wringed 92.
writ, wrote (pret.) 72, 74, 75, 79.
wrote, writ-ten 76—83.
wrung 69, 92.
Yards 34.
ye, you 48, 50, 52, 53.
year-s 32—35.
you'll 26.
you're 26.

Corrections and Additions.

Page IX, l. 28, insert POUTSMA, H., *A Grammar of Late Modern English*, 1904—1905.

- » XIX, l. 14, for *proof* read *proof*.
- » XXI, l. 9, for *businesslike* read *business-like*.
- » XXI, l. 18, before *somewhat* insert *a*.
- » 11, l. 1, for *pecularities* read *peculiarities*.
- » 12, l. 3, for *developes* read *develops*.
- » 31, l. 10, for *Rc* read *RC*.
- » 50, l. 3, after 16.1 insert . . . if you do not go back, where-ever you go, you will . . .
- » 52, l. 25, for *contemporaries* read *contemporaries*.
- » 55, l. 18, for *SWIFT's* read *SWIFT's*.
- » 60, l. 12, for *e.g:* read *e. g.:*
- » 61, l. 19, for *old-fashioned* read *old-fashioned*.
- » 86, l. 1, for *ef* read *of*.
- » 101, l. 24, for *footnotes* read *foot-notes*.
- » 102, l. 13, for *auxiliaires* read *auxiliaries*.
- » 106, l. 15, for *remain But* read *remain. But.*
- » 111, l. 6, for *Shakespeare*, read *Shakespeare*.
- » " l. 9, before *being* insert *that*.
- » " l. 23, for *loose* read *lose*.

14 DAY USE
RETURN TO DESK FROM WHICH BORROWED
LOAN DEPT.

This book is due on the last date stamped below,
or on the due date to which renewed. Renewals only:

Tel. No. 642-3405

Renewals may be made 4 days prior to date due.
Renewed books are subject to immediate recall.

REC'D LD AUG 17 71 4:50 PM 70

REC'D CIRC DEPT MAY 31 1974 39

REC'D CIRC DEPT NOV 9 74

RET'D JUN 25 1982

OCT 07 1989

LD21A-50m2/71
(P2001s10)476--A:32

General Library
University of California
Berkeley

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C021110349

